University of London

608081

REPORTS

FROM

COMMITTEES:

TEN VOLUMES.

—(2.)—

CATTLE PLAGUE AND IMPORTATION OF LIVE STOCK.

Session

8 *February* —— 14 *August* 1877.

VOL. IX.

1877.

REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES:

1877.

TEN VOLUMES:—CONTENTS OF THE

SECOND VOLUME.

N.B.—*THE* Figures *at the* beginning of the line, *correspond with the* N° *at the foot of each* Report; *and the* Figures *at the* end of the line, *refer to the* MS. Paging *of the Volumes arranged for The House of Commons.*

CATTLE PLAGUE AND IMPORTATION OF LIVE STOCK:

362. Report from the Select Committee on Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock; together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, Appendix, and Index - - - - p. 1

REPORT

FROM THE

SELECT COMMITTEE

ON

CATTLE PLAGUE

AND

IMPORTATION OF LIVE STOCK;

TOGETHER WITH THE

PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE,

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE,

AND APPENDIX.

Ordered, by The House of Commons, *to be Printed,*
25 *July* 1877.

362.

Tuesday, 24th April 1877.

Ordered, THAT a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the causes of the recent outbreak of Cattle Plague, and the measures taken for its repression; and into the effect which the importation of live foreign animals has upon the introduction of disease into this country, and upon the supply and price of food.

Tuesday, 1st May 1877.

Ordered, THAT the Committee do consist of Twenty-seven Members.

Committee nominated of—

Sir Henry Selwin Ibbetson.
Mr. William Edward Forster.
Mr. Chaplin.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.
Colonel Kingscote.
Mr. James Corry.
Mr. Pease.
Sir George Jenkinson.
Mr. Chamberlain.
Sir Rainald Knightley.
Mr. Murphy.
Mr. Elliot.
Mr. Mundella.
Mr. Cameron of Lochiel.
Mr. Arthur Peel.
Mr. Ritchie.
Mr. John Holms.
Mr. Torr.
Mr. Anderson.
Major Allen.
Mr. Norwood.
Mr. Assheton.
Mr. French.
Mr. King-Harman.

Thursday, 3rd May 1877.

Further proceeding resumed on nomination of the Committee.

Ordered, THAT Mr. Dease be one other Member of the Committee.

Ordered, THAT Mr. M'Lagan be nominated one other Member of the Committee.

Ordered, THAT the Committee have power to send for Persons, Papers, and Records.

Ordered, THAT Five be the Quorum of the Committee.

Monday, 7th May 1877.

Ordered, THAT the Minutes of the Evidence taken before the Select Committee on Contagious Diseases (Animals) in Session 1873, be referred to the Select Committee on Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock.

REPORT - - - - - - - - - - - - - - p. iii
PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE - - - - - p. xi
MINUTES OF EVIDENCE - - - - - - - - - p. 1
APPENDIX - - - - - - - - - - - - - p. 499

REPORT.

THE SELECT COMMITTEE appointed to inquire into the Causes of the recent Outbreak of CATTLE PLAGUE, and the Measures taken for its Repression; and into the Effect which the Importation of LIVE FOREIGN ANIMALS has upon the Introduction of DISEASE into this COUNTRY, and upon the Supply and Price of FOOD;——HAVE considered the Matters to them referred, and have agreed to the following REPORT:—

1. YOUR Committee have examined witnesses from the Privy Council Department and representatives of the different trades affected, as well as of the agricultural interest, and have taken much evidence as to the dead meat trade recently established with America, and the supply of food to the manufacturing towns.

2. They have had before them the evidence taken upon this subject by the Committee of 1873, and their Report.

3. Your Committee will first consider the question of cattle plague.

4. They have carefully gone into the causes of the recent outbreak, and have ascertained that the disease was imported by animals arriving from Hamburgh before the authorities here had any official intimation of the outbreak at that place. They are glad to be able to report that they are satisfied by the evidence that, with proper regulations, cattle plague might be stamped out in a short time, and that no ground really exists for the fear of its becoming as destructive as it was in 1865. But the existing provisions, whether for its prevention or for its suppression, require considerable improvement.

5. With respect to the risk of introduction of disease into this kingdom, serious difficulties must always surround the importation of cattle from abroad, especially from a country like Germany, with a long exposed frontier. In such a case no measures short of prohibition would give the necessary security; whilst as to other countries the evidence leaves no doubt as to the necessity of Foreign Governments imposing stricter regulations on their export trade in live stock, and especially providing that notice of any outbreak of cattle plague shall be forthwith communicated by telegraph to the authorities of this country. These are matters which should be made the subject of international arrangement.

6. With regard to home arrangements, the recent outbreak in this country suffices to prove that the system under which the powers of dealing with disease are, in the first instance, committed to the local authority, does not work satisfactorily, and that the powers of the Privy Council should, in every instance, be exercised at the earliest moment, and that, with this view, it should be the duty of the local authority at once to inform the Privy Council of any outbreak of the malady.

7. That the power to order the slaughter of suspected animals should extend to animals on premises adjoining to those actually infected seems as necessary to your Committee, as it did to the Committee of 1873.

8. Your Committee are also of opinion that further inducement should be held out to owners of stock to report the first appearance of the cattle plague amongst their stock. At present, whilst one-half of the value is paid as compensation for any animal actually diseased, only three-quarters is allowed for an animal slaughtered on suspicion. Your Committee consider that in the latter case the full value should be paid, subject only to a maximum of 40 *l.*

9. Lastly, your Committee recommend that all compensation for the slaughter of animals on account of cattle plague, whether such animals are actually diseased or only suspected, should in future be defrayed out of imperial and not, as now, out of local funds. This change in the incidence of the charge is almost a necessary consequence of the change previously recommended, under which the order for slaughter will, in all cases, proceed from the central instead of the local authority; but apart from this it appears justified by considerations of public expediency. The rapidity with which cattle plague, if left unchecked, spreads far and wide makes it a matter of general concern that measures should be immediately taken for its suppression. Experience has shown that it can with certainty be suppressed by the slaughter of all animals within the zone of suspicion, and by no other course; and further, that if the case is promptly dealt with, the limits of this zone are comparatively narrow. The order for the necessary slaughter is therefore one which should be made without hesitation, and any compensation which in consequence becomes payable may be deemed a cheap insurance against what would otherwise become a national misfortune.

10. But cattle plague is not the only question. It was abundantly proved in evidence that the ravages of cattle plague since the Act of 1869, and the diminution of the breeding herds of the kingdom from the fear of breaking out of cattle plague are as nothing compared with the losses inflicted and the enterprise checked by pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth complaint. In addition to the losses to the community of animals actually destroyed by either of those diseases, or slaughtered to prevent the spread of pleuro-pneumonia, the agricultural and other witnesses laid great stress on the fact, that whatever loss fell upon the farmer from the deterioration of his stock through foot-and-mouth complaint, reacted injuriously on the consumer, by the diminution in the number of fat stock which the farmer was able to place on the market in a given time.

11. One witness, it is true, Mr. Gebhart, questioned the capability of the grazing lands of the country to support herds much larger than those which now exist, but in this view he stood alone. Witnesses with practical experience like Mr. Booth, Mr. Clare Read, Mr. Jacob Wilson, Mr. James Howard, Mr. Adam Smith, and the President of the Scotch Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Melvin, all agreed that if immunity from these two scourges were assured beforehand, such an increase might be anticipated in the breeding herds as would in the course of a certain time be large enough to make up for whatever diminution of supply might be occasioned by any new restrictions on the import from foreign countries.

12. Both these diseases are attributed to foreign origin; at all events, it was admitted that they are widely prevalent in some countries from which importation now takes place; and the number of cargoes stopped at the ports on account of disease having been actually discovered in the animals when landed, justifies the opinion that in many other cases animals really contagious are passed by the inspectors at the ports, owing to the voyage having been too short to allow the malady to develop to that stage where it is open to detection. This is more especially the case in pleuro-pneumonia, which has often been known to lie dormant for periods varying from two to three months.

13. If, however, it was proved how inseparable from the importation of foreign cattle is the risk of the introduction of these two diseases, it was shown beyond a doubt, that at the present moment they both exist so largely in this country that unless further restrictions are applied to the movements of our home stock, no restrictions on the foreign trade can give the least hope of the eradication of these diseases which is the necessary condition of any adequate development of the home supply. In fact it was admitted by every witness, that if these diseases are to be stamped out, both kinds of restrictions were equally indispensable.

14. In

14. In the opinion, therefore, of your Committee, the first matter to be decided really is, whether the farmers of this country are prepared to submit to the inconvenience of such home regulations as may be found to be requisite. Should this be the case, then, and then only would arise the further question as to whether new restrictions should be placed on the foreign import.

15. Adopting this order, your Committee proceed to consider the home regulations which the various witnesses insisted upon as necessary.

16. On this point, Professor Brown expressed a very strong opinion, that whether for the purpose of dealing with cattle plague, should it arise, or of stamping out pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease, one of the most important amendments of the existing system would be the establishment of uniform regulations applicable to the whole country, such regulations to be issued by the Privy Council, and to be carried out by Privy Council inspectors stationed in each district.

17. So far as relates to the necessity of uniform rules to be issued by the central authority, Professor Brown's views were strongly supported by Lord Fitzhardinge, Mr. Rea, Mr. Wilson, Mr. Stratton, Mr. Adam Smith, Mr. Melvin, Mr. Soulby, and Mr. Clare Read, on the part of the agricultural interests; by Mr. Tisdall, representing the Dairymen's Society; by Mr. Giblett and Mr. Lambert, two salesmen; and by Mr. P. Rudkin, on the part of the market authority of the City of London. The evils of the present want of uniformity were forcibly illustrated by Mr. Wilson's description of the different regulations which had recently prevailed at the meeting point of the districts of three local authorities at Newcastle.

18. But when it came to that part of the suggestion which placed the appointment of the local inspectors in the central authority, the witnesses were not so unanimous. Lord Fitzhardinge, Mr. Rea, Mr. Wilson, Mr. Adam Smith, Mr. Tisdall, and Mr. Stratton were of opinion that if, as they suggested, the central authority were to make regulat ons for the whole of the country, the central authority should also, in order to ensure their regulations being carried out, have the nomination of the inspectors. On the other hand, Mr. Melvin recommended that the localities should appoint their own inspectors as now, but that the Privy Council should have a travelling staff to see that these local inspectors properly carried out the rules, just as inspectors of the Local Government Board supervise the action of the local poor law authorities. Mr. C. Read supported the latter view, with the qualification that all local authorities in the same county should be united for the purpose of appointing inspectors, whilst Mr. James Howard and Mr. Soulby urged that the police, responsible, as they are, to quarter sessions in counties and to town councils in boroughs, are sufficient to carry out any regulations, subject only to the intervention of the Privy Council in the case of a serious outbreak.

19. Your Committee are of opinion that the Privy Council could not undertake the work of local inspection throughout the kingdom, and agree with Mr. Melvin that the appointment of inspectors should rest with the local authority, subject to the supervision of the Privy Council.

20. But whatever difference of opinion existed as to the authority which should enforce the regulations, it was admitted that farmers would find themselves under a much stricter *régime* than that which has hitherto been in operation, inasmuch as in every district where either pleuro-pneumonia or foot-and-mouth disease existed all movement of cattle would be prohibited except under license; fairs and markets would be under similar restrictions, and absolute prohibition of movement would be enforced against infected farms for periods varying from two months in pleuro-pneumonia to 28 days in outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease. Further, the same regulations would have to be extended to Ireland and the Channel Islands, or else animals brought by sea from those parts of the kingdom should not be permitted to be landed except at defined ports, where provision was made for subjecting them to proper inspection.

21. Upon the question whether such restrictions would be accepted, Professor Brown stated his own opinion to be that as these restrictions must be expected

to last for a considerable period before the diseases could be stamped out, the country would not endure them, and would prefer the continuance of the diseases to such a cure. Professor Brown, however, admitted that this opinion was not in accordance with what he had been informed were the views of agriculturists; and as a fact, with the one exception of Mr. Soulby, all the agricultural witnesses who appeared before your Committee—and many of them spoke as representatives of large bodies of farmers in various parts of the country—expressed themselves with confidence that, provided there was an assurance against the re-introduction of disease from abroad, these home regulations would be willingly accepted by the farmers of the country.

22. And your Committee with this evidence before them can hardly resist the conclusion that such would be the case.

23. In the belief then that such regulations as have been indicated would be accepted by the home trade, your Committee pass to the question as to what additional restrictions to the foreign trade would have to be combined with such home regulations in order to give the requisite security.

24. The inspection at the ports being admittedly insufficient as a protection against pleuro-pneumonia, and uncertain even in the case of foot-and-mouth complaint, some witnesses advocated the total prohibition of live animals from abroad, suggesting their slaughter at the port of embarkation. But the greater number of the agricultural witnesses, including Mr. Odams, Mr. James Howard, Mr. Melvin, and Mr. Clare Read, admitted the difficulties of such a course, considering that the country was not prepared for so complete a change, and that the result might be to drive the foreign supply into other markets. They therefore preferred to advise the compulsory slaughter of imported animals at the port of debarkation, all countries, with the exception perhaps of America, being thus treated as scheduled countries are at the present moment.

25. A third proposal which was brought before your Committee was, that on the one hand, so far as regards Belgium and Germany, the importation from those countries of live cattle should be absolutely prohibited, and of live sheep should be allowed only on the condition that they should be slaughtered at the port of debarkation; and that, on the other, as to unscheduled countries, such as Spain, Portugal, and Denmark now are, all animals coming from there should be freely admitted into our ports and allowed to pass inland, provided only that the Privy Council were satisfied with the precautionary regulations in force in such countries.

26. This suggestion as to the prohibition of the importation of cattle from Germany and Belgium, was founded on the extreme uncertainty of obtaining timely information here of any outbreak of disease in Germany, and on the consideration that Belgium is a transit country for German cattle.

27. On the wholé, after considering the various alternatives, your Committee would recommend that, as a statutory arrangement, the importation of all animals from Russia, and all cattle from Germany (with the exception of Schleswig-Holstein) and Belgium, should be prohibited, and these last two countries as to other animals, and the rest of Europe as to all animals, should be added to the list of scheduled countries, with power to the Privy Council to forbid the importation of animals from other countries if they think fit.

And all fat cattle imported therefrom should be slaughtered at the port, such ports being defined, of debarkation; and that all store, or dairy, cattle should be quarantined for 14 days at certain defined ports of lading. Such stock, on removal, to be registered as to where sent, and there to be under restraint and immovable for two months.

28. Your Committee believe that these combined restrictions at the ports and inland, would succeed, if enforced, in stamping out these diseases, and assuming this to be the case, the great question would still remain how far the result would affect the supply of meat to the country, especially to large manufacturing towns.

29. It was acknowledged that to bring about such an increase in the home supply as the witnesses anticipated from the greater security against these complaints,

complaints, must take time; and the foreign importers and salesmen who opposed these restrictions asserted, as they did in 1873, that any such interference with the present established trade as would arise from slaughter at the ports would drive the foreign trade to other markets, and thus not only reduce the supply and make meat dearer, but in the interval before the promised increase in the home stock had been realised, raise the price of meat unduly in many of our inland towns.

30. On the other hand, many practical witnesses assured your Committee that instead of diminishing and driving away the supply, the establishment of any fixed rule rendering slaughter at the port compulsory would really increase the number and the quality of the animals sent. They pointed out that the present regulations are not favourable to the exporter. The fact that if on the arrival of his cargo at the port of debarkation disease is detected he has to reship his animals and take them on to Deptford, or some other port for immediate slaughter, renders him at all times uncertain of his market, and frequently puts him to much expense. The same causes, in their opinion, operate injuriously to Deptford Market itself. The supply to that market mainly comes either from countries temporarily scheduled, *i. e.*, countries from which cattle cannot be imported except into a port where provision is made for their immediate slaughter, or else from casual cargoes which were originally consigned to other ports, but which on account of infection having broken out it has been necessary to bring on to Deptford for slaughter. The supply, therefore, is uncertain from day to day; buyers in consequence are not attracted, and from the want of competition prices are irregular. If, on the other hand, it was once made a rule that all foreign animals are to be slaughtered on their arrival in port, it was confidently asserted that a steady trade would arise, and competition be the same as at Islington Market; and in confirmation of this view it was shown that during the recent period of restrictions large supplies had been sent over with the full knowledge that the animals would be slaughtered at the port.

31. It was next objected, that even if the number of animals sent to this country was not diminished by the animals being slaughtered at the ports, the difficulties of carrying the animals from those ports as dead meat to the inland towns would in hot weather be so great as to deprive those towns of much of their present supply, more particularly in foreign sheep; and the butchers from northern towns especially urged that their trade could not be carried on unless they were able as now to take the live animals from the port of debarkation to their own slaughter-houses, there to be killed as wanted for their customers.

32. But the evidence given by Mr. Rudkin, strengthened as it was by that of the Deputy Chairman of the Great Western Railway, Sir Alexander Wood, and other witnesses, lead your Committee to believe that these fears are without foundation, that there is no real difficulty in the supply of dead meat, and, with proper arrangements, even of offal to these towns, and that for some time a dead-meat trade, especially in sheep, has been regularly carried on from the Deptford Market all over the country, increasing since the restrictions were enforced. Dead sheep have been also sent in large numbers to Wales, not unfrequently coming back to London as Welch mutton. And the fact that the Aberdeen supply of dead meat to the London market has of late largely increased (reaching an average of from 60 or 70 tons a day, even in hot weather), affords additional evidence in this direction.

33. Having, then, carefully considered the evidence, your Committee have arrived at the conclusion that compulsory slaughter, at the port of debarkation, is not likely either to discourage foreign importation, or to diminish the supply of our large towns, or generally to raise the price of meat. The change, however, would be a considerable interferenee with the present system of trade carried on by butchers and salesmen. For this reason, and because proper arrangements would in many cases have to be made at the ports selected for debarkation, your Committee feel that it would be well to postpone the commencement of the change for a time sufficient to enable the necessary preparations to be carried out.

34. With regard to the importation of dead meat from America, as affecting this question, the evidence shows that there are hardly any limits to the amount of meat which can be imported from that country; that in cool weather the meat can without difficulty be delivered here in perfect order, and that with greater care in the packing, and with better arrangements for storage here, it could be brought over in the hottest months. American meat already forms a useful supplementary supply to the meat markets of this country, and in no very distant future will probably constitute a most important addition, and will materially aid the carrying out of such a system as your Committee have suggested above. But the trade is at present in too uncertain and experimental a condition to justify reliance upon it for an unfailing supply.

35. Another important recommendation which was suggested for checking the spread of these diseases was made by Mr. Rudkin, Mr. Gebhart, and other witnesses; viz., that cattle exposed in Islington Market should not be allowed to be removed for exposure in any other market. For this purpose, they proposed that all animals, on arriving at Islington, should be marked for slaughter, and that the making use of such mark in other places, or the exposure in any other market of an animal so marked, should be prohibited under severe penalties. It was shown that this market is the hot-bed of various diseases, more especially that the lairs are tainted with the foot-and-mouth disease, and that it is the practice of small jobbers to buy fat beasts in this market in order to remove them for re-sale to some local market, where they are necessarily brought into contact with both fat and store stock, and thus become the means of setting up fresh sources of contagion in various parts of the country. These jobbers would no doubt be affected by the restriction proposed, but no loss would fall on either the producer or the consumer, and your Committee have no hesitation in recommending the change as one of considerable value.

36. In connection with this part of the subject, the attention of your Committee was also directed to the prevalence of disease in the dairy sheds in the metropolis and large towns, and the great danger of contagion being carried from them into the markets, and thus spread throughout the country. The evidence showed the constantly-changing nature of the trade, that cows are sent into the markets on showing the least symptom of being affected, and their places filled by fresh stock. The danger from these sheds was strikingly proved by the last outbreak of cattle plague in London.

Much evidence was also given as to the feasibility of superseding town dairies by milk from the country. It was proved that by far the larger part of the present supply of London was brought from dairy farms established for the purpose, often at a considerable distance from town; nor is there any reason to suppose that the milk thus supplied is inferior in quality. Mr. Tisdall, who appeared on the part of the Dairy Association, stated that there was no difference in the quality or the price of the milk produced as between his dairy at Epsom and his cow-shed in London, and admitted that the metropolitan supply from the country dairies arrived in perfect condition. From his evidence your Committee were also led to believe that the Dairy Association were well aware of the dangers of infection from their town sheds, and were willing to submit to regulations and inspection. On the whole, notwithstanding much evidence against the continuance of dairy-sheds in large towns, your Committee are of opinion that if registration, a real inspection, and sufficient regulations as to the movement of animals to and from these places are enforced, they may be allowed to remain without danger to the public.

37. Your Committee have already alluded to the necessity which, in the event of the same regulations not being adopted in the three parts of the kingdom, would arise for defining ports in Great Britain, where alone animals from Ireland or the Channel Islands would be allowed to be imported by sea, and where they would be examined by an inspector before being suffered to pass inland. The evidence of Lord Fitzhardinge and Mr. Peters showed that it has

has occurred that infected animals from Ireland have been landed at a British port where there is no provision for inspection, and have been then driven through healthy districts to the various markets, and thus distributed throughout the country. Such a system your Committee feel could not be permitted to continue if, with a view to stamp out the diseases, Great Britain was subjected to regulations controlling the movement of home stock, and adding permanently to the number of scheduled countries. And your Committee think it to be their duty, in view of the evidence which they have received, to recommend that a searching inquiry should be made into the subject of the transit of cattle from Ireland to the ports of Great Britain; into the provisions made for their reception at the ports of departure and of arrival, and into their treatment during the voyage.

38. In conclusion, your Committee recommend as follows:—

1. That as a statutory arrangement the importation of all animals from Russia, and of cattle from Germany (except Schleswig-Holstein) and Belgium, be prohibited, whilst that of other animals from these last two countries, and of all animals from the rest of Europe, should be subject to the provisions of the same schedule; power being reserved to the Privy Council to prohibit the importation of animals from other countries if they think fit. An exception, however, should be made in favour of store and dairy animals, provided they remain in quarantine for 14 days, and afterwards are placed under inspection for two months.

2. That the Privy Council should be empowered to deal directly with the cattle plague whenever it appears in this country, and that for this purpose it should receive from the local authority immediate notice of every outbreak.

3. That the power to order the slaughter of animals suspected of cattle plague should extend to animals in premises adjoining to the infected premises.

4. That whilst the compensation for the slaughter of animals affected by cattle plague should remain as it is at present, the compensation for the slaughter of animals suspected of that disease should be the full value (not however exceeding 40 *l.*).

5. That all compensation for the animals so slaughtered, whether diseased or suspected, should be defrayed from imperial funds.

6. That in case of pleuro-pneumonia or foot-and-mouth disease breaking out, the Privy Council should have power to fix the limits of the district which is to be treated as infected.

7. That uniform rules applicable to all districts declared infected should be issued by the Privy Council, but should be enforced by the local authority, subject to the supervision of the Privy Council.

8. That, in the case of pleuro-pneumonia, the compensation for the slaughter of animals, whether suspected or diseased, should be at the same rate as in the case of cattle plague, but should be payable out of local funds.

9. That stock exposed in Islington Market should not be allowed to leave the metropolitan district alive.

10. That, in the metropolis and large towns, dairy and cattle sheds should be subject to registration, inspection, and regulations.

11. That the restrictions applicable to Great Britain should be extended to Ireland and the Channel Islands, or else that ports should be specified in Great Britain by the Privy Council, to which alone importation of live animals from Ireland and the Channel Islands should be lawful, the animals not being permitted to be taken inland unless examined and passed by a Privy Council inspector at the port of debarkation.

12. And your Committee are of opinion that no further restrictions should be placed on the importation of foreign animals in respect to foot-

and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia, unless at the same time orders be enforced throughout Great Britain, that in every district where either pleuro-pneumonia or foot-and-mouth disease exists, and which has been declared by the Privy Council to be infected, all movement of cattle be prohibited except under license; that fairs and markets be under similar restrictions, and that absolute prohibition of movement be enforced against infected farms for periods varying from two months in pleuro-pneumonia, to 28 days in outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease.

13. That where required effect should be given by the Legislature to these recommendations.

25 *July* 1877.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE.

Tuesday, 8*th May* 1877.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sir Henry Selwin Ibbetson.	Mr. Elliot.
Mr. James Corry.	Colonel Kingscote.
Sir George Jenkinson.	Sir Rainald Knightley.
Mr. M'Lagan.	Mr. King-Harman.
Mr. Arthur Peel.	Mr. French.
Mr. Chamberlain.	Mr. Torr.
Mr. John Holms.	Mr. Murphy.
Mr. Anderson.	Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.
Mr. William Edward Forster.	Major Allen.

Sir HENRY SELWIN IBBETSON was called to the Chair.

The Committee deliberated.

[Adjourned till Friday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Friday, 11*th May* 1877.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sir HENRY SELWIN IBBETSON in the Chair.

Mr. Pease.	Mr. Arthur Peel.
Colonel Kingscote.	Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.
Mr. M'Lagan.	Sir Rainald Knightley.
Mr. William Edward Forster.	Mr. Elliot.
Mr. Chamberlain.	Mr. Cameron of Lochiel.
Mr. Jacob Bright.	Mr. John Holms.
Mr. King-Harman.	Mr. Chaplin.
Mr. James Corry.	Mr. Norwood.
Mr. Anderson.	Major Allen.
Mr. Assheton.	Mr. Dease.
Mr. French.	Sir George Jenkinson.
Mr. Torr.	

Professor *George Thomas Brown* was examined.

[Adjourned till Tuesday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, 15*th May* 1877.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sir HENRY SELWIN IBBETSON in the Chair.

Mr. William Edward Forster.	Mr. Assheton.
Mr. Jacob Bright.	Mr. Anderson.
Major Allen.	Mr. Chaplin.
Mr. Arthur Peel.	Mr. Ritchie.
Colonel Kingscote.	Mr. Norwood.
Mr. French.	Sir Rainald Knightley.
Mr. Elliot.	Sir George Jenkinson.
Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.	Mr. Cameron of Lochiel.
Mr. Pease.	Mr. James Corry.
Mr. Torr.	

Count *C. F. Danneskcild-Samsoe* was examined.

Professor *George Thomas Brown* was further examined.

[Adjourned till Thursday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Thursday, 17th May 1877.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sir HENRY SELWIN IBBETSON in the Chair.

Mr. Chaplin.	Mr. Assheton.
Major Allen.	Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Arthur Peel.	Mr. Chamberlain.
Colonel Kingscote.	Sir Rainald Knightley.
Sir George Jenkinson.	Mr. Norwood.
Mr. Torr.	

Professor *George Thomas Brown* was further examined.

Professor *James Beart Simonds* was examined.

[Adjourned till Monday, 4th June, at Twelve o'clock.

Monday, 4th June 1877.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sir HENRY SELWIN IBBETSON in the Chair.

Mr. Assheton.	Sir Rainald Knightley.
Mr. Arthur Peel.	Mr. Pease.
Colonel Kingscote.	Mr. Ritchie.
Mr. Chaplin.	Mr. M'Lagan.
Mr. Jacob Bright.	Mr. Torr.
Mr. Elliot.	Mr. Anderson.
Mr. William Edward Forster.	Mr. John Holms.
Mr. James Corry.	Mr. Chamberlain.

Professor *Charles Müller* and Mr. *Thomas Swan* were examined.

[Adjourned till Wednesday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Wednesday, 6th June 1877.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sir HENRY SELWIN IBBETSON in the Chair.

Mr. Chaplin.	Mr. James Corry.
Mr. Arthur Peel.	Mr. M'Lagan.
Colonel Kingscote.	Mr. Torr.
Mr. John Holms.	Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.
Mr. Anderson.	Mr. French.
Mr. Assheton.	Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. Elliot.	Mr. Murphy.
Mr. Norwood.	Sir Rainald Knightley.
Mr. William Edward Forster.	Mr. Pease.

Mr. *Mark Whitwill* and Mr. *John William May* were examined.

Mr. *G. A. Thommsen*, was examined through an interpreter.

Mr. *Thomas Christopher Booth* was examined.

[Adjourned till Friday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Friday, 8*th June* 1877.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Sir HENRY SELWIN IBBETSON in the Chair.

Sir William Edward Forster.	Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.
Mr. Assheton.	Mr. M'Lagan.
Mr. Elliot.	Mr. Cameron of Lochiel.
Mr. Arthur Peel.	Mr. Torr.
Colonel Kingscote.	Mr. Murphy.
Mr. Anderson.	Sir Rainald Knightley.
Mr. John Holms.	Mr. Norwood.
Mr. Chaplin.	Mr. Pease.

The Baron *Fr. Von Behr*, Mr. *Charles Lennox Peel*, Mr. *Murillo H. Gillett*, Mr. *Richard Hall*, and Mr. *John David Link*, were examined.

[Adjourned till Monday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Monday, 11*th June* 1877.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON in the Chair.

Mr. Arthur Peel.	Mr. Cameron of Lochiel.
Colonel Kingscote.	Mr. Chaplin.
Mr. Anderson.	Mr. French.
Mr. John Holms.	Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. Norwood.	Mr. Ritchie.
Mr. Assheton.	Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.
Mr. Torr.	Mr. Murphy.
Mr. M'Lagan.	Mr. William Edward Forster.
Mr. Jacob Bright.	Sir Rainald Knightley.
Mr. Elliot.	Mr. Pease.
Mr. King-Harman.	

Mr. *Alfred Lyon* and Mr. *George Rea* were examined.

[Adjourned till Wednesday next, at Twelve o'clock

Wendesday, 13*th June* 1877.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sir HENRY SELWIN IBBETSON in the Chair.

Mr. Arthur Peel.	Mr. Dease.
Colonel Kingscote.	Mr. French.
Mr. John Holms.	Mr. Cameron of Lochiel.
Mr. Assheton.	Mr. King-Harman.
Mr. Elliot.	Mr. Norwood.
Mr. M'Lagan.	Mr. Jacob Bright.
Major Allen.	Mr. Torr.
Mr. James Corry.	Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. William Edward Forster.	Mr. Ritchie.
Mr. Anderson.	Mr. Murphy.

Mr. *Charles Lennox Peel* was further examined.

Mr. *Septimus Lambert*, Mr. *Archibald Hamilton*, and Mr. *John Prince Sheldon* were examined.

[Adjourned till Friday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Friday, 15*th June* 1877.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sir HENRY SELWIN IBBETSON in the Chair.

Major Allen.
Colonel Kingscote.
Mr. James Corry.
Mr. Elliot.
Mr. M'Lagan.
Mr. Anderson.
Mr. Cameron of Lochiel.
Mr. Torr.
Mr. Assheton.
Mr. Dease.
Mr. Norwood.
Mr. French.
Mr. King-Harman.
Mr. Murphy.
Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.
Sir Rainald Knightley.
Sir George Jenkinson.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. William Edward Forster.
Mr. Arthur Peel.

Mr. *Jacob Wilson* and Mr. *Herman Gebhardt* were examined.

[Adjourned till Monday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Monday, 18*th June* 1877.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sir HENRY SELWIN IBBETSON in the Chair.

Mr. William Edward Forster.
Major Allen.
Mr. Chaplin.
Colonel Kingscote.
Mr. Anderson.
Mr. John Holms.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Mundella.
Mr. Elliot.
Mr. Assheton.
Sir George Jenkinson.
Mr. Arthur Peel.
Mr. M'Lagan.
Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.
Mr. Torr.
Mr. King-Harman.
Mr. Ritchie.
Mr. French.
Mr. Dease.
Mr. Norwood.
Sir Rainald Knightley.
Mr. Murphy.

The Right Honourable Lord *FitzHardinge* (attending by permission of the House of Lords), and Mr. *James Peters* were examined.

Mr. *Herman Gebhardt* was further examined.

[Adjourned till Wednesday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Wednesday, 20*th June* 1877.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sir HENRY SELWIN IBBETSON in the Chair.

Major Allen.
Mr. Arthur Peel.
Colonel Kingscote.
Mr. Dease.
Mr. Murphy.
Mr. Elliot.
Mr. M'Lagan.
Mr. King-Harman.
Mr. Chaplin.
Mr. James Corry.
Mr. Cameron of Lochiel.
Mr. Torr.
Mr. French.
Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.
Mr. Assheton.
Mr. Anderson.
Mr. Pease.

Mr. *Marcus Pool* and Mr. *Josiah Burkett* were examined.

[Adjourned till Friday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Friday, 22*nd June* 1877.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sir HENRY SELWIN IBBETSON in the Chair.

Mr. Chaplin.	Mr. French.
Major Allen.	Mr. Murphy.
Mr. Arthur Peel.	Mr. Dease.
Colonel Kingscote.	Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Anderson.	Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. Cameron of Lochiel.	Mr. Ritchie.
Mr. William Edward Forster.	Mr. John Holms.
Mr. Assheton.	Sir Rainald Knightley.
Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.	Mr. Torr.
Mr. Elliot.	Mr. Norwood.
Mr. King-Harman.	Sir George Jenkinson.

Mr. *John Giblett*, Mr. *William Stratton*, and Professor *John Gamgee*, were examined.

[Adjourned till Monday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Monday, 25*th June* 1877.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sir HENRY SELWIN IBBETSON in the Chair.

Mr. William Edward Forster.	Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. M'Lagan.	Mr. James Corry.
Mr. Jacob Bright.	Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.
Mr. Arthur Peel.	Mr. French.
Mr. Anderson.	Sir Rainald Knightley.
Mr. Assheton.	Sir George Jenkinson.
Colonel Kingscote.	Mr. Ritchie.
Major Allen.	Mr. Torr.
Mr. Chaplin.	Mr. Murphy.
Mr. Mundella.	

Professor *John Gamgee* was further examined.

Mr. *John Soulby* and Sir *Alexander Wood* were examined.

[Adjourned till Wednesday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Wednesday, 27*th June* 1877.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sir HENRY SELWIN IBBETSON in the Chair.

Mr. Arthur Peel.	Mr. M'Lagan.
Colonel Kingscote.	Mr. Dease.
Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.	Major Allen.
Mr. Torr.	Mr. King-Harman.
Mr. Elliot.	Mr. John Holms.
Mr. Anderson.	Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. Pease.	Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. William Edward Forster.	Mr. Chaplin.
Mr. Norwood.	Mr. Mundella.

Mr. *Thomas John Luya*, Mr. *William Walker*, and Mr. *James Odams*, were examined.

[Adjourned till Friday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Friday, 29th June 1877.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sir HENRY SELWIN IBBETSON in the Chair.

Mr. M'Lagan.	Mr. French.
Mr. Jacob Bright.	Mr. King-Harman.
Mr. Elliot.	Mr. Cameron of Lochiel.
Mr. James Corry.	Mr. Assheton.
Mr. Arthur Peel.	Mr. Dease.
Colonel Kingscote.	Mr. Murphy.
Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.	Sir Rainald Knightley.
Major Allen.	Mr. Norwood.
Mr. Pease.	Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. Anderson.	

Mr. *James Howard,* Mr. *Adam Smith,* and Mr. *Anthony George Robinson,* were examined.

[Adjourned till Monday next, at Twelve o'clock

Monday, 2nd July 1877.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sir HENRY SELWIN IBBETSON in the Chair.

Mr. William Edward Forster.	Mr. Dease.
Mr. M'Lagan.	Mr. French.
Mr. Elliot.	Mr. Torr.
Mr. Arthur Peel.	Mr. King-Harman.
Major Allen.	Mr. Ritchie
Mr. Norwood.	Mr. Chaplin.
Mr. John Holms.	Sir Rainald Knightley.
Colonel Kingscote.	Mr. Murphy.
Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.	

Mr. *James Melvin,* Mr. *Thomas Rudkin,* and Mr. *Henry Knowles,* were examined.

[Adjourned till Wednesday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Wednesday, 4th July 1877.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sir HENRY SELWIN IBBETSON in the Chair.

Colonel Kingscote.	Mr. Norwood.
Mr. Anderson.	Mr. William Edward Forster.
Mr. Pease.	Mr. Assheton.
Mr. Arthur Peel.	Mr. King-Harman.
Mr. Elliot.	Sir George Jenkinson.
Mr. Cameron of Lochiel.	Mr. M'Lagan.
Mr. James Corry.	Mr. Torr.
Mr. Jacob Bright.	Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. Dease.	Sir Rainald Knightley.

Mr. *Edmund Charles Tisdall,* Mr. *Clare Sewell Read* (a Member of the House), and Mr. *Henry Etridge Wilkinson,* were examined.

[Adjourned till Friday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Friday, 6th July 1877

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sir HENRY SELWIN IBBETSON in the Chair.

Mr. William Edward Forster.	Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.
Mr. Assheton.	Mr. Arthur Peel.
Mr. Elliot.	Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. Pease.	Mr. King-Harman.
Mr. John Holms.	Mr. French.
Colonel Kingscote.	Mr. Murphy.
Mr. James Corry.	Mr. Ritchie.
Mr. Torr.	Mr. Norwood.
Mr. Jacob Bright.	Mr. M'Lagan.
Sir Rainald Knightley.	Sir George Jenkinson.

The Committee deliberated.

Motion made and Question, "That the evidence given by Mr. Wilkinson be struck out"—(Colonel *Kingscote*),—put, and *agreed to.*

Mr. *Charles Lennox Peel* and Professor *George Thomas Brown* were further examined.

[Adjourned till Thursday, 19th July, at Twelve o'clock.

Thursday, 19th July 1877.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sir HENRY SELWIN IBBETSON in the Chair.

Mr. Chaplin.	Mr. Dease.
Mr. Arthur Peel.	Mr. Murphy.
Colonel Kingscote.	Mr. Elliot.
Mr. Anderson.	Mr. Assheton.
Mr. John Holms.	Mr. Pease.
Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.	Sir Rainald Knightley.
Mr. Torr.	Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. James Corry.	

Professor *George Thomas Brown* was further examined.

Mr. *William Payne* was examined.

[Adjourned till Monday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Monday, 23rd July 1877.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sir HENRY SELWIN IBBETSON in the Chair.

Mr. Torr.	Mr. King-Harman.
Mr. Assheton.	Mr. M'Lagan.
Sir Rainald Knightley.	Colonel Kingscote.
Mr. Arthur Peel.	Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.
Major Allen.	Mr. Dease.
Mr. Anderson.	Mr. Cameron of Lochiel.
Mr. French.	Mr. Pease.
Mr. Chaplin.	Mr. Ritchie.
Mr. Elliot.	Sir George Jenkinson.
Mr. Chamberlain.	Mr. Murphy.
Mr. William Edward Forster.	Mr. Norwood.

DRAFT REPORT proposed by the Chairman, read the first time, as follows:—

"YOUR Committee have examined witnesses from the Privy Council Department and representatives of the different trades affected, as well as of the agricultural interest, and have taken much evidence as to the dead meat trade recently established with America, and the supply of food to the manufacturing towns.

"2. They have had before them the evidence taken upon this subject by the Committee of 1873, and their Report.

"3. Your Committee will first consider the question of cattle plague.

"4. They have carefully gone into the causes of the recent outbreak, and have ascertained that the disease was imported by animals arriving from Hamburg before the authorities here had any official intimation of the outbreak at that place. They are glad to be able to report that they are satisfied by the evidence that, with proper regulations, cattle plague might be stamped out in a short time, and that no ground really exists for the fear of its becoming as destructive as it was in 1865. But the existing provisions, whether for its prevention or for its suppression, require considerable improvement.

"5. With respect to the introduction of disease into this kingdom, serious difficulties must always surround the importation of cattle from abroad, especially from a country like Germany, with a long exposed frontier. In such a case no measures short of prohibition would give the necessary security; whilst as to other countries the evidence leaves no doubt as to the necessity of foreign Governments imposing stricter regulations on their export trade in live stock, and especially providing that notice of any outbreak of cattle plague shall be forthwith communicated by telegraph to the authorities of this country. These are matters which should be made the subject of international arrangement.

"6. With regard to home arrangements, the recent outbreak in this country suffices to prove that the system under which the powers of dealing with disease are, in the first instance, committed to the local authority, does not work satisfactorily, and that the powers of the Privy Council, which at present do not arise until the failure of the action of the local authority, should, in every instance, be exercised at the earliest moment, and that, with this view, it should be the duty of the local authority at once to inform the Privy Council of any outbreak of the malady.

"7. That the power to order the slaughter of suspected animals should extend to animals on premises adjoining to those actually infected seems as necessary to your Committe, as it did to the Committee of 1873.

"8. Your Committee are also of opinion that further inducement should be held out to farmers to report the first appearance of the cattle plague amongst their stock. At present, whilst one-half of the value is paid as compensation for any animal actually diseased, only three-quarters is allowed for an animal slaughtered on suspicion. Your Committee consider that in the latter case the full value should be paid, subject only to a maximum of 40*l.*

"9. Lastly, your Committee recommend that all compensation for the slaughter of animals on account of cattle plague, whether such animals are actually diseased or only suspected, should in future be defrayed out of imperial and not, as now, out of local funds. This change in the incidence of the charge is almost a necessary consequence of the change previously recommended, under which the order for slaughter will, in all cases, proceed from the central instead of the local authority; but apart from this it appears justified by considerations of public expediency. The rapidity with which cattle plague, if left unchecked, spreads far and wide makes it a matter of general concern that measures should be immediately taken for its suppression. Experience has shown that it can with certainty be suppressed by the slaughter of all animals within the zone of suspicion, and by no other course; and further, that if the case is promptly dealt with, the limits of this zone are comparatively narrow. The order for the necessary slaughter is therefore one which should be made without hesitation, and any compensation which in consequence becomes payable may be deemed a cheap insurance against what would otherwise become a national misfortune.

"10. But cattle plague is not the only question. It was abundantly proved in evidence that the ravages of cattle plague and the diminution of the breeding herds of the kingdom from the fear of breaking out of cattle plague are as nothing compared with the losses inflicted and the enterprise checked by pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth complaint. In addition to the losses to the community of animals actually destroyed by either of those diseases, or slaughtered to prevent the spread of pleuro-pneumonia, the agricultural witnesses laid great stress on the fact, that whatever loss fell upon the farmer from the deterioration of his stock through foot-and-mouth complaint, reacted injuriously on the consumer, by the diminution in the number of fat stock which the farmer was able to place on the market in a given time.

"11. One witness, it is true, Mr. Gebhart, questioned the capability of the grazing lands of the country to support herds much larger than those which now exist, but in this view he stood alone. Witnesses with practical experience like Mr. Booth, Mr. Read, Mr. Jacob Wilson, Mr. James Howard, Mr. Adam Smith, and the President of the Scotch

Scotch Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Melvin, all agreed that if immunity from these two scourges were assured beforehand, such an increase might be anticipated in the breeding herds as would in the course of a certain time be large enough to make up for whatever diminution of supply might be occasioned by any new restrictions on the import from foreign countries.

" 12. Both these diseases are attributed to foreign origin; at all events, it was admitted that they are widely prevalent in many of the countries from which importation now takes place; and the number of cargoes stopped at the ports on account of disease having been actually discovered in the animals when landed, justifies the opinion that in many other cases animals really contagious are passed by the inspectors at the ports, owing to the length of the voyage having been too short to allow the malady to develop to that stage where it is open to detection. This is more especially the case in pleuro-pneumonia, which has often been known to lie dormant for periods varying from two to three months.

" 13. If, however, it was proved how inseparable from the importation of foreign cattle is the risk of the introduction of these two diseases, it was shown beyond a doubt that at the present moment they both exist so largely in this country, that unless further restrictions are applied to the movements of our home stock, no restrictions on the foreign trade can give the least hope of the eradication of these diseases which is the necessary condition of any adequate development of the home supply. In fact, it was admitted by every witness, that if these diseases are to be stamped out, both kinds of restrictions were equally indispensable.

" 14. In the opinion, therefore, of your Committee, the first matter to be decided really is, whether the farmers of this country are prepared to submit to the inconvenience of such home regulations as may be found to be requisite. Should this be the case, then, and then only, would arise the further question as to whether new restrictions should be placed on the foreign import.

" 15. Adopting this order, your Committee proceed to consider the home regulations which the various witnesses insisted upon as necessary.

" 16. On this point Professor Brown expressed a very strong opinion, that whether for the purpose of dealing with cattle plague, should it arise, or of stamping out pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease, one of the most important amendments of the existing system would be the establishment of uniform regulations applicable to the whole country, such regulations to be issued by the Privy Council, and to be carried out by Privy Council inspectors stationed in each district.

" 17. So far as relates to the necessity of uniform rules to be issued by the central authority, Professor Brown's views were strongly supported by Lord Fitzhardinge, Mr. Rea, Mr. Wilson, Mr. Stratton, Mr. Adam Smith, Mr. Melvin, Mr. Soulby, and Mr. Clare Sewell Read, on the part of the agricultural interests; by Mr. Tisdall, representing the Dairymen's Society; by Mr. Giblett and Mr. Lambert, two salesmen; and by Mr. P. Rudkin, on the part of the market authority of the City of London. And the evils of the present want of uniformity were forcibly illustrated by Mr. Wilson's description of the different regulations which had recently prevailed at the meeting point of the districts of three local authorities at Newcastle.

" 18. But when it came to that part of the suggestion which placed the appointment of the local inspectors in the central authority, the witnesses were not so unanimous. Lord Fitzhardinge, Mr. Rea, Mr. Wilson, Mr. Adam Smith, Mr. Tisdall, and Mr. Stratton were of opinion that if, as they suggested, the central authority were to make regulations for the whole of the country, the central authority should also, in order to ensure their regulations being carried out, have the nomination of the inspectors. On the other hand, Mr. Melvin recommended that the localities should appoint their own inspectors as now, but that the Privy Council should have a travelling staff to see that these local inspectors properly carried out the rules, just as inspectors of the Local Government Board supervise the action of the local poor law authorities. Mr. C. Read supported the latter view, with the qualification that all local authorities in the same county should be united for the purpose of appointing inspectors, whilst Mr. James Howard and Mr. Soulby urged that the police, responsible as they are to quarter sessions in counties and to town councils in boroughs, are sufficient to carry out any regulations, subject only to the intervention of the Privy Council in the case of a serious outbreak.

" 19. Your Committee are of opinion that the Privy Council could not undertake the work of local inspection throughout the kingdom, and agree with Mr. Melvin that the appointment of inspectors should rest with the local authority, subject to the supervision of the Privy Council.

" 20. But whatever difference of opinion existed as to the authority which should enforce the regulations, it was admitted that farmers would find themselves under a much stricter *régime* than that which has hitherto been in operation, inasmuch as in every district where either pleuro-pneumonia or foot-and-mouth disease existed all movement of cattle would be prohibited except under license; fairs and markets would be under similar restrictions, and absolute prohibition of movement would be enforced against infected farms for periods

varying from two months in pleuro-pneumonia to 28 days in outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease. Further, the same regulations would have to be extended to Scotland and Ireland, or else animals brought by sea from those parts of the kingdom should not be permitted to be landed except at defined ports, where provision was made for subjecting them to proper inspection.

"21. Upon the question whether such restrictions would be accepted, Professor Brown stated his own opinion to be that as these restrictions must be expected to last for a considerable period before the diseases could be stamped out, the country would not endure them, and would prefer the continuance of the diseases to such a cure. Professor Brown, however, admitted that this opinion was not in accordance with what he had been informed were the views of agriculturists; and as a fact, with the one exception of Mr. Soulby, all the agricultural witnesses who appeared before your Committee—and many of them spoke as representatives of large bodies of farmers in various parts of the country—expressed themselves with confidence that, provided there was an assurance against the re-introduction of disease from abroad, these home regulations would be willingly accepted by the farmers of the country.

"22. And your Committee with this evidence before them can hardly resist the conclusion that such would be the case.

"23. In the belief then that such regulations as have been indicated would be accepted by the home trade, your Committee pass to the question as to what additional restrictions to the foreign trade would have to be combined with such home regulations in order to give the requisite security.

"24. The inspection at the ports being admittedly insufficient as a protection against pleuro-pneumonia, and uncertain even in the case of foot-and-mouth complaint, some witnesses advocated the total prohibition of live animals from abroad, suggesting their slaughter at the port of embarkation. But the greater number of the agricultural witnesses, including Mr. Odams, Mr. James Howard, Mr. Melvin, and Mr. Clare Read, admitted the difficulties of such a course, considering that the country was not prepared for so complete a change, and that the result might be to drive the foreign supply into other markets. They therefore preferred to advise the compulsory slaughter of imported animals at the port of debarkation, all countries, with the exception perhaps of America, being thus treated as scheduled countries are at the present moment.

"25. A third proposal which was brought before your Committee was, that on the one hand, so far as regards Belgium and Germany, the importation from those countries of live cattle should be absolutely prohibited, and of live sheep should be allowed only on the condition that they should be slaughtered at the port of debarkation; and that, on the other, as to unscheduled countries, such as Spain, Portugal, and Denmark now are, all animals coming from there should be freely admitted into our ports and allowed to pass inland, provided only that the Privy Council were satisfied with the precautionary regulations in force in such countries.

"26. This suggestion as to the prohibition of the importation of cattle from Germany and Belgium, was founded on the extreme uncertainty of obtaining timely information here of any outbreak of disease in Germany, and on the consideration that Belgium is a transit country for German cattle. On the other hand, the proposal to continue the freedom of importation from countries now unscheduled, was justified by the evidence of many witnesses, as well as the official returns of our imports, showing that these countries practically enjoy immunity from disease. At the same time, inasmuch as the English authorities can exercise no direct control over the safeguards to be taken in foreign territory, it seems to your Committee expedient that power should be reserved to the Privy Council in case of the outbreak of any contagious disease, or in the event of the safeguards provided being insufficient, to bring any of these countries under the schedule for so long a period as may be necessary.

"27. On the whole, after considering the various alternatives, your Committee would recommend that from Sweden and Norway, Denmark, Spain, Portugal, and America, importation should be permitted as now, subject only to inspection at the port of debarkation; but that any of these countries should on the outbreak therein of any contagious or infectious disease be liable to be placed temporarily by Order in Council in the list of scheduled countries; and that as a statutory arrangement the importation of cattle from Russia, Germany (with the exception of Schleswig-Holstein), and Belgium, should be prohibited, whilst these countries as to other animals, and the rest of Europe as to all animals, should be permanently added to the list of scheduled countries.

"28. Your Committee believe that these combined restrictions at the ports and inland, would succeed in stamping out these diseases, and assuming this to be the case, the great question would still remain how far the result would affect the supply of meat to the country, especially to large manufacturing towns.

"29. It was acknowledged that to bring about such an increase in the home supply as the witnesses anticipated from the greater security against these complaints, must take time; and the foreign importers and salesmen who opposed these restrictions asserted, as they did in 1873, that any considerable addition to the number of scheduled countries would

would drive the foreign trade to other markets, and thus not only reduce the supply and make meat dearer, but in the interval before the promised increase in the home stock had been realised, raise the price of meat to famine rates in many of our inland towns.

"30. On the other hand, many practical witnesses assured your Committee that instead of diminishing and driving away the supply, the extension of any fixed rule rendering slaughter at the port compulsory, would really increase the number and the quality of the animals sent. They pointed out that the present regulations are not favourable to the exporter. The fact that if on the arrival of his cargo at the port of debarkation disease is detected he has to re-ship his animals and take them on to Deptford, or some other port for immediate slaughter, renders him at all times uncertain of his market, and frequently puts him to much expense. The same causes operate injuriously to Deptford Market itself. The supply to that market mainly comes either from countries temporarily scheduled, *i. e.*, countries from which cattle cannot be imported, except into a port where provision is made for their immediate slaughter, or else from casual cargoes which were originally consigned to other ports, but which on account of infection having broken out it has been necessary to bring on to Deptford for slaughter. The supply, therefore, is uncertain from day to day; buyers in consequence are not attracted, and from the want competition prices rule low. If on the other hand, by the addition to the number of scheduled countries, the cases were multiplied in which foreign animals are to be slaughtered on their arrival in port, it was confidently asserted that a steady trade would arise, and competition be the same as at Islington Market; and in confirmation of this view it was shown that during the recent period of restrictions large supplies had been sent over with the full knowledge that the animals would be slaughtered at the port.

"31. It was next objected, that even if the number of animals sent to this country was not diminished by an extension of the law requiring slaughter at the ports, the difficulties of carrying the animals from those ports as dead meat to the inland towns would in hot weather be so great as to deprive those towns of much of their present supply, more particularly in foreign sheep; and the butchers from northern towns especially urged that their trade could not be carried on unless they were able as now to take the live animals from the port of debarkation to their own slaughter-houses, there to be killed as wanted for their customers.

"32. But the evidence given by Mr. Rudkin, strengthened as it was by that of the deputy chairman of the Great Western Railway, Sir Alexander Wood, and other witnesses, conclusively proved that these fears are without foundation, that there is no real difficulty in the supply of dead meat, and with proper arrangements, even of offal to these towns, and that for some time a dead meat trade, especially in sheep, has been regularly carried on from the Deptford Market all over the country, increasing since the restrictions were enforced. Dead sheep have been also sent in large numbers to Wales, not unfrequently coming back to London as Welch mutton. And the fact that the Aberdeen supply of dead meat to the London market has of late largely increased (reaching an average of from 60 to 70 tons a day, even in hot weather), affords additional evidence in this direction.

"33. Having, then, carefully considered the evidence, your Committee have arrived at the conclusion that compulsory slaughter, at the port of debarkation, to the extent they have recommended, is not likely either to discourage foreign importation, or to diminish the supply of our large towns, or generally to raise the price of meat.

"34. With regard to the importation of dead meat from America, as affecting this question, the evidence shows that there are no limits to the amount of meat which can be imported from that country; that in cool weather the meat can with no difficulty be delivered here in perfect order, and that with greater care in the packing, and with better arrangements for storage here, it could be brought over in the hottest months. American meat already forms a useful supplementary supply to the meat markets of this country, and in no very distant future will probably constitute a most important addition, and will materially aid the carrying out of such a system as your Committee have suggested above. But the trade is at present in too uncertain and experimental a condition to justify reliance upon it for an unfailing supply.

"35. Another important recommendation which was suggested for checking the spread of these diseases was made by Mr. Rudkin, Mr. Gebhart, and other witnesses; viz., that fat cattle exposed in Islington Market should not be allowed to be removed for exposure in any other market. For this purpose, they proposed that all animals, on arriving at Islington, should be branded for slaughter, and that the making use of such brand in other places, or the exposure in any other market of an animal so branded, should be prohibited under severe penalties. It was shown that this market is the hot-bed of various diseases, more especially that the lairs are tainted with the foot-and-mouth disease, and that it is the practice of small jobbers to buy fat beasts in this market in order to remove them for re-sale to some local market, where they are necessarily brought into contact with both fat and store stock, and thus become the means of setting up fresh sources of contagion in various parts of the country. These jobbers would no doubt be affected by the restriction proposed, but no loss would fall on either the producer or the consumer, and your Committee have no hesitation in recommending the change as one of considerable value.

"36. In connection with this part of the subject, the attention of your Committee was also directed to the prevalence of disease in the dairy sheds in the metropolis and large towns, and the great danger of contagion being carried from them into the markets, and thus spread throughout the country. The evidence showed the constantly-changing nature of the trade, that cows are sent into the markets on showing the least sympton of being affected, and their places filled by fresh stock. The danger from these sheds was strikingly proved by the last outbreak of cattle plague in London.

Much evidence was also given as to the feasibility of superseding town dairies by milk from the country. It was proved that the larger part of the present supply of London was brought from dairy farms established for the purpose, often at a considerable distance from town; nor is there any reason to suppose that the milk thus supplied is inferior in quality. Mr. Tisdall, who appeared on the part of the Dairy Association, stated that there was no difference in the quality or the price of the milk produced as between his dairy at Epsom and his cow-shed in London itself, and admitted that the metropolitan supply from the Aylesbury and other dairies arrived in perfect condition. From his evidence your Committee were also led to believe that the Dairy Association were well aware of the dangers of infection from their town sheds, and were willing to submit to regulations and inspection. On the whole, notwithstanding much evidence against the continuance of dairy sheds in large towns, your Committee are of opinion that if a real inspection, and sufficient regulations as to the movement of animals to and from these places are enforced, they may be allowed to remain without danger to the public.

"37. Your Committee have already alluded to the necessity which, in the event of the same regulations not being adopted in the three parts of the kingdom, would arise for defining ports in England where alone animals from Scotland or Ireland would be allowed to be imported by sea, and where they would be examined by an inspector before being suffered to pass inland. The evidence of Lord Fitzhardinge and Mr. Peters showed that at present it often occurs that infected animals from Ireland are landed at an English port where there is no provision for inspection, and are then driven through healthy districts to the various markets, and thus distributed throughout the country. Such a system your Committee feel could not be permitted to continue if, with a view to stamp out the diseases, England was subjected to regulations controlling the movement of home stock, and adding permanently to the number of scheduled countries.

"38. In conclusion, your Committee recommend as follows:—

"A.—With respect to cattle plague:

"1. That the Privy Council should be empowered to deal directly with the cattle plague whenever it appears in this country, and that for this purpose it should receive from the local authority immediate notice of every outbreak.

"2. That the power to order the slaughter of suspected animals should extend to animals in premises adjoining to the infected premises.

"3. That whilst the compensation for the slaughter of diseased animals should remain as it is at present, the compensation for the slaughter of suspected animals should be the full value (not however exceeding 40 *l.*).

"4. That all compensation for the slaughtered animals, whether diseased or suspected, should be defrayed from Imperial funds.

"B.—As to pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth diseases:

"5. That Sweden and Norway, Denmark, Spain, Portugal, and America, or any of them, should, on the outbreak therein of any contagious disease, be liable to be placed temporarily in the list of scheduled countries. That as a statutory arrangement the importation of cattle from Russia, Germany (except Schleswig-Holstein), and Belgium be prohibited, whilst that of other animals from those countries, and of all animals from the rest of Europe, should be subject to the provisions of the same schedule.

"6. That in cases of pleuro-pneumonia or foot-and-mouth disease breaking out, the Privy Council should have power to fix the limits of the district which is to be treated as infected.

"7. That uniform rules applicable to all districts declared infected should be issued by the Privy Council, but should be enforced by the local authority, subject to the supervision of the Privy Council.

"8. That, in the case of pleuro-pneumonia, the compensation for the slaughter of animals, whether suspected or diseased, should be at the same rate as in the case of cattle plague, but should be payable out of local funds.

"9. That fat stock exposed in Islington Market should not be allowed to be removed for exposure in any other market.

"10. That, in the metropolis and large towns, dairy sheds should be subject to inspection and regulations.

"11. That the restrictions applicable to England should be extended to Scotland

Scotland and Ireland, or else that ports should be specified in England to which alone importation of live animals from Scotland or Ireland should be lawful, the animals not being permitted to be taken inland unless examined and passed by a Privy Council inspector at the port of debarkation.

"12. That effect should be given by the Legislature to these recommendations."

DRAFT REPORT proposed by the *Chairman*, read a second time, paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraph 1, *agreed to.*

Paragraph 2.—Amendment proposed at the end of the paragraph, to add the words, "and, after careful investigation, they agree with the recommendation in that Report, that no change should be made in the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869, so far as it relates to the importation of foreign animals"—(Mr. *William Edward Forster*).—Question put, That those words be there added.—The Committee divided:

Ayes, 4.	Noes, 17.
Mr. Anderson.	Major Allen.
Mr. Chamberlain.	Mr. Assheton.
Mr. William Edward Forster.	Mr. Cameron of Lochiel.
Mr. Arthur Peel.	Mr. Chaplin.
	Mr. Dease.
	Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.
	Mr. Elliot.
	Mr. French.
	Sir. George Jenkinson.
	Mr. King-Harman.
	Colonel Kingscote.
	Sir Rainald Knightley.
	Mr. M'Lagan.
	Mr. Murphy.
	Mr. Pease.
	Mr. Ritchie.
	Mr. Torr.

Paragraph *agreed to.*

Paragraphs 3—4, *agreed to.*

Paragraph 5.—Amendment proposed, in line 3, after the word "frontier," to leave out the words "in such a case no measures short of prohibition would give the necessary security"—(Mr. *William Edward Forster*).—Question put, That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the paragraph.—The Committee divided:

Ayes, 15.	Noes, 6.
Major Allen.	Mr. Anderson.
Mr. Assheton.	Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. Cameron of Lochiel.	Mr. William Edward Forster.
Mr. Chaplin.	Mr. Pease.
Mr. Dease.	Mr. Arthur Peel.
Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.	Mr. Ritchie.
Mr. Elliot.	
Mr. French.	
Sir George Jenkinson.	
Mr. King-Harman.	
Colonel Kingscote.	
Sir Rainald Knightley.	
Mr. M'Lagan.	
Mr. Murphy.	
Mr. Torr.	

Paragraph *agreed to.*

Paragraph 6, amended, and *agreed to.*

Paragraph 7, *agreed to.*

Paragraph 8, amended, and *agreed to.*

Paragraph 9.—Amendment proposed to leave out Paragraph 9—(Mr. *William Edward Forster*).—

Forster).—Question put, That the paragraph stand part of the proposed Report.—The Committee divided:

Ayes, 19.	Noes, 3.
Major Allen.	Mr. Anderson.
Mr. Assheton.	Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. Cameron of Lochiel.	Mr. William Edward Forster.
Mr. Chaplin.	
Mr. Dease.	
Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.	
Mr. Elliot.	
Mr. French.	
Sir George Jenkinson.	
Mr. King-Harman.	
Colonel Kingscote.	
Sir Rainald Knightley.	
Mr. M'Lagan.	
Mr. Murphy.	
Mr. Norwood.	
Mr. Pease.	
Mr. Arthur Peel.	
Mr. Ritchie.	
Mr. Torr.	

Paragraph 10.—Amendment proposed in line 2, to leave out from the words "the ravages," down to the word "complaint" in line 5 (both inclusive), in order to insert the words, "Serious losses have also been inflicted and much enterprise checked by the existence of pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease"—(Mr. *Arthur Peel*).—Question put, That the words, "The ravages of cattle plague," stand part of the proposed Report.—The Committee divided:

Ayes, 16.	Noes, 5.
Major Allen.	Mr. Anderson.
Mr. Assheton.	Mr. Cameron of Lochiel.
Mr. Chamberlain.	Mr. William Edward Forster.
Mr. Chaplin.	Mr. French.
Mr. Dease.	Mr. Arthur Peel.
Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.	
Mr. Elliot.	
Sir George Jenkinson.	
Mr. King-Harman.	
Colonel Kingscote.	
Mr. M'Lagan.	
Mr. Murphy.	
Mr. Norwood.	
Mr. Pease.	
Mr. Ritchie.	
Mr. Torr.	

An Amendment made.—Another Amendment proposed (at the end of the last Amendment), after "1869" to leave out the words "and the diminution of the breeding herds of the kingdom from the fear of breaking out of cattle plague"—(Mr. *M'Lagan*).—Question put, That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the paragraph.—The Committee divided:

Ayes, 15.	Noes, 6.
Major Allen.	Mr. Assheton.
Mr. Anderson.	Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.
Mr. Cameron of Lochiel.	Mr. William Edward Forster.
Mr. Chamberlain.	Mr. French.
Mr. Chaplin.	Mr. M'Lagan.
Mr. Dease.	Mr. Arthur Peel.
Mr. Elliot.	
Sir George Jenkinson.	
Mr. King-Harman.	
Colonel Kingscote.	
Mr. Murphy.	
Mr. Norwood.	
Mr. Pease.	
Mr. Ritchie.	
Mr. Torr.	

Another Amendment proposed, in line 3, to leave out the words "as nothing," in order to insert the words "small as"—(Sir *George Jenkinson*).—Question put, That the words

words "as nothing" stand part of the paragraph,"—put, and *agreed to*.—Another Amendment made.—Another Amendment proposed, in line 8, after the word "his," to insert the words "fat and other"—(Mr. *Pease*).—Question, That the words "fat and other" be there inserted "—put, and *negatived*.—Paragraph, as amended, *agreed to*.

Paragraghs 11–12 amended, and *agreed to*.

Paragraphs 13–16, *agreed to*.

Paragraph 17, amended, and *agreed to*.

Paragraphs 18–19, *agreed to*.

Paragraph 20, amended, and *agreed to*.

Paragraphs 21–25, *agreed to*.

Paragraph 26, *postponed*.

[Adjourned till To-morrow, at Twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, 24th July 1877.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sir HENRY SELWIN IBBETSON, in the Chair.

Mr. Torr.	Mr. William Edward Forster.
Major Allen.	Mr. Anderson.
Mr. Pease.	Mr. Cameron of Lochiel.
Mr. John Holms.	Mr. Norwood.
Mr. Elliot.	Mr. Dease.
Mr. French.	Sir Rainald Knightley.
Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.	Mr. Murphy.
Mr. Arthur Peel.	Sir George Jenkinson.
Mr. Assheton.	Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. Ritchie.	Mr. King-Harman.
Mr. Chaplin.	Mr. Mundella.
Colonel Kingscote.	Mr. M'Lagan.

Paragraph 27.—Amendment proposed, in line 2, to leave out from the word "recommend" to the end of the paragraph, in order to insert the words: "The compulsory slaughter at the port of debarkation of all animals, imported for the purposes of food, from foreign countries (except Canada and the United States of America) not declared to be infected with cattle plague. The Privy Council, as at present, to have power to prohibit importation from any country during the period it is declared to be so infected"—(Mr. *Norwood*).—Question put, That the word "that" stand part of the paragraph.—The Committee divided:

Ayes, 18.	Noes, 3.
Major Allen.	Mr. Assheton.
Mr. Anderson.	Mr. Pease.
Mr. Cameron of Lochiel.	Mr. Ritchie.
Mr. Chamberlain.	
Mr. Chaplin.	
Mr. Dease.	
Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.	
Mr. Elliot.	
Mr. William Edward Forster.	
Mr. French.	
Mr. John Holms.	
Sir George Jenkinson.	
Colonel Kingscote.	
Sir Rainald Knightley.	
Mr. Murphy.	
Mr. Pease.	
Mr. Arthur Peel.	
Mr. Torr.	

Another Amendment proposed, in line 2, to leave out from the word "that" to the end of the paragraph, in order to add the words: "As a statutory arrangement, the

importation of cattle from Russia, Germany (with the exception of Schleswig-Holstein and Belgium, should be prohibited, and that all these countries as to other animals, and the rest of Europe as to all animals, should be permanently added to the list of scheduled countries.

"And all fat cattle imported therefrom should be slaughtered at the port, such ports being defined, of debarkation; and that all store or dairy cattle should be quarantined for 14 days at certain defined ports of landing. Such stock, on removal, to be registered as to where sent, and there to be under restraint and immovable for two months"—(Mr. *Elliot*).

Question put, That the words "From Sweden and Norway" stand part of the paragraph.—The Committee divided:

Ayes, 8.	Noes, 15.
Mr. Anderson.	Major Allen.
Mr. Chamberlain.	Mr. Assheton.
Mr. William Edward Forster.	Mr. Cameron of Lochiel.
Mr. John Holms.	Mr. Chaplin.
Mr. Mundella.	Mr. Dease.
Mr. Pease.	Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.
Mr. Arthur Peel.	Mr. Elliot.
Mr. Ritchie.	Mr. French.
	Sir George Jenkinson.
	Mr. King-Harman.
	Colonel Kingscote.
	Sir Rainald Knightley.
	Mr. Murphy.
	Mr. Norwood.
	Mr. Torr.

Question proposed, That the proposed words be added instead thereof.—Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment to leave out the first words, "as a statutory arrangement," in order to insert the words "discretion of the Privy Council"—(Mr. *Anderson*).—Question put, That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment.—The Committee divided:

Ayes, 15.	Noes, 8.
Major Allen.	Mr. Anderson.
Mr. Assheton.	Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. Cameron of Lochiel.	Mr. William Edward Forster.
Mr. Chaplin.	Mr. John Holms.
Mr. Dease.	Mr. Mundella.
Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.	Mr. Norwood.
Mr. Elliot.	Mr. Pease.
Mr. French.	Mr. Arthur Peel.
Sir George Jenkinson.	
Mr. King-Harman.	
Colonel Kingscote.	
Sir Rainald Knightley.	
Mr. Murphy.	
Mr. Ritchie.	
Mr. Torr.	

Another Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment to leave out the word "cattle," in order to insert the words "all animals"—(The *Chairman*).—Question put, That the word "cattle" stand part of the proposed Amendment.—The Committee divided:

Ayes, 7.	Noes, 16.
Mr. Anderson.	Major Allen.
Mr. Chamberlain.	Mr. Assheton.
Mr. William Edward Forster.	Mr. Cameron of Lochiel.
Mr. John Holms.	Mr. Chaplin.
Mr. Mundella.	Mr. Dease.
Mr. Norwood.	Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.
Mr. Arthur Peel.	Mr. Elliot.
	Mr. French.
	Sir George Jenkinson.
	Mr. King-Harman.
	Colonel Kingscote.
	Sir Rainald Knightley.
	Mr. Murphy.
	Mr. Pease.
	Mr. Ritchie.
	Mr. Torr.

Question, That the words "all animals" be there inserted,—put, and *agreed to*.—Another Amendment made to the proposed Amendment.—Another Amendment proposed to the

the proposed Amendment, after the words "Schleswig-Holstein,"—to insert the words "Austro-Hungary"—(Mr. *King-Harman*).—Question proposed, That those words be there inserted.—Amendment, and Question by leave, *withdrawn*.

Another Amendment proposed to proposed Amendment, after the word "Belgium," to insert the following words: "and any country which does not provide proper safeguards against the introduction of cattle plague"—(Mr. *Wilbraham Egerton*).—Question, That those words be there inserted,—put, and *negatived*.—Another Amendment proposed to proposed Amendment, after the word "Belgium," to insert the following words, "and any other countries where cattle plague is known to exist"—(Sir *George Jenkinson*).—Question, That those words be there inserted,—put, and *negatived*.—Other Amendments made.

Another Amendment proposed to proposed Amendment, after the words "scheduled countries," to insert the words, "with power to the Privy Council to forbid the importation of animals from other countries, if they think fit"—(Mr. *French*).—Question put, That those words be there inserted.—The Committee divided:

Ayes, 14.	Noes, 8.
Major Allen.	Mr. Anderson.
Mr. Cameron of Lochiel.	Mr. Assheton.
Mr. Chaplin.	Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. Dease.	Mr. John Holms.
Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.	Mr. Mundella.
Mr. Elliot.	Mr. Norwood.
Mr. French.	Mr. Arthur Peel.
Sir George Jenkinson.	Mr. Ritchie.
Mr. King-Harman.	
Colonel Kingscote.	
Sir Rainald Kinghtley.	
Mr. Murphy.	
Mr. Pease.	
Mr. Torr.	

Another Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment, after the words "two months," to add the following words: "Provided that the Privy Council shall have the power from time to time to move countries out of the list of scheduled countries when they are of opinion that such countries are free from cattle plague, pleuro-pneumonia, and foot-and-mouth disease"—(Mr. *Pease*).—Question put, That those words be there added.—The Committee divided:

Ayes, 10.	Noes, 13.
Mr. Anderson.	Major Allen.
Mr. Chamberlain.	Mr. Assheton.
Mr. William Edward Forster.	Mr. Cameron of Lochiel.
Mr. John Holms.	Mr. Chaplin.
Mr. Mundella.	Mr. Dease.
Mr. Norwood.	Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.
Mr. Pease.	Mr. Elliot.
Mr. Arthur Peel.	Mr. French.
Mr. Ritchie.	Sir George Jenkinson.
Mr. Torr.	Mr. King-Harman.
	Colonel Kingscote.
	Sir Rainald Knightley.
	Mr. Murphy.

Another Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment, after the words "two months," to add the words: "Provided that the Privy Council shall have power to admit into the list of schedule countries Germany (except Holstein) and Belgium, when they are of opinion that it is safe to do so"—(Mr. *Pease*).—Question put, That those words be there added.—The Committee divided:

Ayes, 9.	Noes, 15.
Mr. Anderson.	Major Allen.
Mr. Chamberlain.	Mr. Assheton.
Mr. William Edward Forster.	Mr. Cameron of Lochiel.
Mr. John Holms.	Mr. Chaplin.
Mr. Mundella.	Mr. Dease.
Mr. Norwood.	Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.
Mr. Pease.	Mr. Elliot.
Mr. Arthur Peel.	Mr. French.
Mr. Ritchie.	Sir George Jenkinson.
	Mr. King-Harman.
	Colonel Kingscote.
	Sir Rainald Knightley.
	Mr. M'Lagan.
	Mr. Murphy.
	Mr. Torr.

Question, That the Amendment, as amended, be added to the paragraph,—put, and *agreed to.*

Question put, That the paragraph, as amended, stand part of the proposed Report.—The Committee divided:

Ayes, 15.	Noes, 9.
Major Allen.	Mr. Anderson.
Mr. Assheton.	Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. Cameron of Lochiel.	Mr. William Edward Forster.
Mr. Chaplin.	Mr. John Holms.
Mr. Dease.	Mr. Mundella.
Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.	Mr. Norwood.
Mr. Elliot.	Mr. Pease.
Mr. French.	Mr. Arthur Peel.
Sir George Jenkinson.	Mr. Ritchie.
Mr. King-Harman.	
Colonel Kingscote.	
Sir Rainald Knightley.	
Mr. M'Lagan.	
Mr. Murphy.	
Mr. Torr.	

Paragraph 28.—Amended, and *agreed to.*

Paragraph 29.—Amendments made.—Another Amendment proposed, in line 7, to leave out the words "to famine rates"—(Mr. *Chaplin*).—Question, That the words "to famine rates" stand part of the paragraph,—put, and *negatived.*—An Amendment made.—Paragraph, as amended, *agreed to.*

Paragraphs 30—32, amended, and *agreed to.*

Paragraph 33, amended.—Question, That the paragraph, as amended, stand part of the proposed Report.—The Committee divided:

Ayes, 14.	Noes, 7.
Major Allen.	Mr. Anderson.
Mr. Assheton.	Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. Chaplin.	Mr. William Edward Forster.
Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.	Mr. John Holms.
Mr. Elliot.	Mr. Mundella.
Mr. French.	Mr. Pease.
Mr. King-Harman.	Mr. Arthur Peel.
Colonel Kingscote.	
Sir Rainald Knightley.	
Mr. M'Lagan.	
Mr. Murphy.	
Mr. Norwood.	
Mr. Ritchie.	
Mr. Torr.	

Paragraphs 34—36, amended, and *agreed to.*

Paragraph 37.—Amendments made.—Another Amendment proposed, at the end of the paragraph, to add the words: "And your Committee think it to be their duty, in view of the evidence which they have received, to recommend that a searching inquiry should be made into the subject of the transit of cattle from Ireland to the ports of Great Britain; into the provisions made for their reception at the ports of departure and of arrival, and into their treatment during the voyage"—(Mr. *Arthur Peel*).—Question, That those words be there added,—put, and *agreed to.*—Paragraph, as amended, *agreed to.*

Paragraph 38.—Amendments made.—Another Amendment proposed, in Sub-section 8. After the words "slaughter of" to insert the word "diseased"—(Mr. *Wilbraham Egerton*).—Question put, That the word "diseased" be there inserted.—The Committee divided:

Ayes, 11.	Noes, 12.
Mr. Anderson.	Major Allen.
Mr. Assheton.	Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. Cameron of Lochiel.	Mr. Chaplin.
Mr. Dease.	Mr. William Edward Forster.
Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.	Mr. French.
Mr. Elliot.	Mr. John Holms.
Colonel Kingscote.	Sir George Jenkinson.
Mr. M'Lagan.	Mr. King-Harman.
Mr. Pease.	Sir Rainald Knightley.
Mr. Arthur Peel.	Mr. Mundella.
Mr. Torr.	Mr. Murphy.
	Mr. Norwood.

Another

Another Amendment proposed, in Sub-section 8, to leave out the word "local," in order to insert the word "Imperial"—(Mr. *Chaplin.*—Question put, That the word "local" stand part of the paragraph.—The Committee divided:

Ayes, 15.	Noes, 8.
Mr. Anderson.	Major Allen.
Mr. Cameron of Lochiel.	Mr. Assheton.
Mr. Chamberlain.	Mr. Chaplin.
Mr. Dease.	Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.
Mr. William Edward Forster.	Mr. Elliot.
Mr. French.	Sir George Jenkinson.
Mr. John Holmes.	Colonel Kingscote.
Mr. King-Harman.	Sir Rainald Knightley.
Mr. M'Lagan.	
Mr. Mundella.	
Mr. Murphy.	
Mr. Norwood.	
Mr. Pease.	
Mr. Arthur Peel.	
Mr. Torr.	

Other Amendments made.—Another Amendment proposed, after Sub-section 11, to insert the following Sub-section:—"And your Committee are of opinion that no further restrictions should be placed on the importation of foreign animals in respect to foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia, unless at the same time orders be enforced throughout Great Britain, that in every district where either pleuro-pneumonia or foot-and-mouth disease exists, all movement of cattle be prohibited, except under license; that fairs and markets be under similar restrictions, and that absolute prohibition of movement be enforced against infected farms for periods varying from two months in pleuro-pneumonia, to 28 days in outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease"—(Mr. *William Edward Forster*).

Question proposed, That those words be there inserted.—Amendment proposed to proposed Amendment, after the word "exists" to insert the following words: "and which has been declared by the Privy Council to be infected"—(*The Chairman*).—Question put, That those words be there inserted.—The Committee divided:

Ayes, 14.	Noes, 9.
Major Allen.	Mr. Anderson.
Mr. Assheton.	Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. Cameron of Lochiel.	Mr. Chaplin.
Mr. Dease.	Mr. William Edward Forster.
Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.	Mr. John Holms.
Mr. Elliot.	Sir George Jenkinson.
Mr. French.	Mr. Mundella.
Mr. King-Harman.	Mr. Norwood.
Colonel Kingscote.	Mr. Arthur Peel.
Sir Rainald Knightley.	
Mr. M'Lagan.	
Mr. Murphy.	
Mr. Pease.	
Mr. Torr.	

Question put, That the proposed Sub-section, as amended, be there inserted.—The Committee divided:

Ayes, 16.	Noes, 7.
Mr. Anderson.	Major Allen.
Mr. Assheton.	Mr. Chaplin
Mr. Cameron of Lochiel.	Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.
Mr. Chamberlain.	Mr. Elliot.
Mr. Dease.	Mr. French.
Mr. William Edward Forster.	Sir George Jenkinson.
Mr. John Holmes.	Sir Rainald Knightley.
Mr. King-Harman.	
Colonel Kingscote.	
Mr. M'Lagan.	
Mr. Mundella.	
Mr. Murphy.	
Mr. Norwood.	
Mr. Pease.	
Mr. Arthur Peel.	
Mr. Torr.	

Another Amendment made.—Paragraph, as amended, *agreed to.*

Postponed paragraph 26, amended, and *agreed to.*

Question put, That this Report, as amended, be the Report of the Committee to the House.—The Committee divided:

Ayes, 16.	Noes, 7.
Major Allen.	Mr. Anderson.
Mr. Assheton.	Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. Cameron of Lochiel.	Mr. William Edward Forster.
Mr. Chaplin.	Mr. John Holms.
Mr. Dease.	Mr. Mundella.
Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.	Mr. Norwood.
Mr. Elliot.	Mr. Arthur Peel.
Mr. French.	
Sir George Jenkinson.	
Mr. King-Harman.	
Colonel Kingscote.	
Sir Rainald Knightly.	
Mr. M'Lagan.	
Mr. Murphy	
Mr. Pease.	
Mr. Torr.	

Ordered, To Report, together with the Minutes of Evidence and an Appendix.

EXPENSES OF WITNESSES.

Name of Witness.	Profession or Condition.	From whence Summoned.	Number of Days Absent from Home under Orders of Committee.	Allowance during Absence from Home.	Expenses of Journey to London and back.	TOTAL Expenses allowed to Witness.
				£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.
Mr. Mark Whitwell	Shipowner	Bristol	3	3 3 –	2 10 –	5 13 –
Mr. Archibald Hamilton	Flesher	Glasgow	3	2 5 –	5 15 –	8 – –
Mr. Richard Hall	Wholesale butcher and Navy contractor.	Liverpool	3	3 3 –	3 3 –	6 6 –
Mr. Septimus Lambert	Cattle salesman	Stratford, Manchester.	3	3 3 –	3 4 –	6 7 –
Mr. John Soully	Merchant	Malton	3	3 3 –	3 8 –	6 11 –
Mr. Walker	Butcher	Leeds	2	1 10 –	2 –	3 15 –
Mr. James Melvin	Farmer	Edinburgh	3	3 3 –	5 14 –	8 17 –
Mr. Adam Smith	ditto	Haddington	3	3 3 –	5 14 –	8 17 –
Mr. Thomas J. Luya	Inspector of meat under Corporation of Liverpool.	Liverpool	3	3 3 –	2 3 6	5 6 6
Mr. John Prince Sheldon	Farmer	Buxton	3	3 3 –	2 13 6	5 16 6
				TOTAL £.		65 9 –

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

LIST OF WITNESSES.

Friday, 11*th May* 1877.

	PAGE
Professor George Thomas Brown - -	1

Tuesday, 15*th May* 1877.

Count C. F. Danneskiold-Samsoe - -	25
Professor George Thomas Brown - -	31

Thursday, 17*th May* 1877.

Professor George Thomas Brown - -	49
Professor James Beart Simonds - -	61

Monday, 4*th June* 1877.

Professor Charles Müller - - -	73
Mr. Thomas Swan - - - -	88

Wednesday, 6*th June* 1877.

Mr. Mark Whitwell - - - -	97
Mr. John William May - - -	102
Mr. G. A. Thomsen - - - -	109
Mr. Thomas Christopher Booth - -	112

Friday, 8*th June* 1877.

Baron Fr. von Behr - - - -	123
Mr. Charles Lennox Peel - - -	132
Mr. Murillo H. Gillett - - - -	132
Mr. Richard Hall - - - - -	143
Mr. John David Link - - - -	151

Monday, 11*th June* 1877.

Mr. Alfred Lyon - - - - -	156
Mr. George Rea - - - - -	175

Wednesday, 13*th June* 1877.

Mr. Charles Lennox Peel - - -	186
Mr. Septimus Lambert, jun. - - -	186
Mr. Archibald Hamilton - - -	199
Mr. John Prince Sheldon - - -	206

Friday, 15*th June* 1877.

Mr. Jacob Wilson - - - - -	217
Mr. Herrman Gebhardt - - -	237

Monday, 18*th June* 1877.

	PAGE
Right Hon. Francis William, Baron Fitzhardinge - - - - -	244
Mr. James Peters - - - - -	247
Mr. Hermann Gebhardt - - -	249

Wednesday, 20*th June* 1877.

Mr. Marcus Pool - - - - -	269
Mr. Josiah Burkett - - - -	284

Friday, 22*nd June* 1877.

Mr. John Giblett - - - - -	297
Mr. William Stratton - - - -	311
Professor John Gamgee - - - -	320

Monday, 25*th June* 1877.

Professor John Gamgee - - - -	327
Mr. John Soulby - - - - -	338
Sir Charles Alexander Wood - -	343

Wednesday, 27*th June* 1877.

Mr. Thomas John Luya - - - -	353
Mr. William Walker - - - -	362
Mr. James Odams - - - - -	367

Friday, 29*th June* 1877.

Mr. James Howard - - - -	377
Mr. Adam Smith - - - - -	391
Mr. Anthony George Robinson - -	395

Monday, 2*nd July* 1877.

Mr. James Melvin - - - -	406
Mr. Thomas Rudkin - - - -	414
Mr. Henry Knowles - - - -	428

Wednesday, 4*th July* 1877.

Mr. Edmund Charles Tisdall - - -	433
Mr. Clare Sewell Read, M.P. - - -	438

Friday, 6*th July* 1877.

Mr. Charles Lennox Peel - - -	456
Professor George Thomas Brown - -	457

Thursday, 19*th July* 1877.

Professor George Thomas Brown - -	484
Mr. William Payne - - - -	496

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

Friday, 11*th May* 1876.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Major Allen.
Mr. Anderson.
Mr. Assheton.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Cameron of Lochiel.
Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. Chaplin.
Mr. James Corry.
Mr. Dease.
Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.
Mr. Elliot.
Mr. W. E. Forster.
Mr. French.
Mr. John Holms.
Sir George Jenkinson.
Mr. King-Harman.
Colonel Kingscote.
Mr. M'Lagan.
Sir Rainald Knightley.
Mr. Norwood.
Mr. Pease.
Mr. Arthur Peel.
Sir Henry Selwin Ibbetson.
Mr. Torr.

SIR HENRY SELWIN IBBETSON, IN THE CHAIR.

Professor GEORGE THOMAS BROWN, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

1. YOU are attached, I believe, to the Privy Council Department, having charge of the diseases of animals in the country?—I am the professional officer of the Veterinary Department.

2. As such, you are able to tell the Committee what measures have been adopted in that department since the last outbreak of cattle plague in the country, in 1865, 1866, and 1867?—The measures chiefly relate to the passing of the two Acts of Parliament, and several Orders of Council. The cattle plague appeared in this country in June 1865, and it was not finally extinguished until the last week in August 1867. During the progress of the plague, various Orders were issued giving certain powers to local authorities, and also to inspectors appointed by them, and by the Privy Council. The chief legislative measure, during the prevalence of the disease, was the passing of the Cattle Diseases Prevention Act, of the 20th February 1866, 28 & 29 Vict. c. 2. Under that Act foreign animals were only to be landed at certain ports, and they were not to be moved from the town or place alive; but exceptions were afterwards made in favour of the metropolis, and cattle were allowed to be moved along a defined route from Thames Haven, which is in the Port of London; also from Harwich, and from Southampton,

Chairman—continued.

to the metropolis. At that time, as the Committee I have no doubt are aware, there was a cordon drawn round the metropolis, and animals could not be moved across the boundaries alive. In June 1867, an Order was passed providing for the detention of foreign cattle for 12 hours at the landing-place, or in some lair adjacent to it, for the purpose of inspection. In October 1867, another Order was passed restricting the number of ports where foreign animals could be landed. Then followed various Orders of Council, directed against the importation of either cattle plague or sheep pox. In July 1868, owing to the prevalence of sheep pox, sheep were scheduled from Holstein, and also from Hamburg. Then, in August 1869, the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, which is now in force, was passed. In that Act pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease were, for the first time I believe, in this country, included in the definition of contagious diseases.

3. And that Act gave power also with regard to defining the limits of ports, did it not?—Yes, it gave power to define the limits of ports, and it also enumerated certain countries from which animals could only be imported for the purpose of slaughter. Those countries were named "scheduled countries."

4. Was

Professor *Brown.*

11 May 1877.

Chairman—continued.

4. Was France at that time first added to the schedule?—France was not added to the schedule until September 1870.

5. Sheep and goats from France and Belgium were scheduled, were they not, in 1870?—In 1870, owing to the prevalence of cattle plague on the Continent, sheep and goats from Germany, France, and Belgium, were scheduled. Cattle, meat, and hides, were prohibited from France and Belgium in March 1871.

6. About that time there had been a foreign market created at Deptford, had there not, for the slaughter of foreign cattle?—Yes, and the market was opened in December 1871. The cordon was removed from the metropolis in January 1872.

7. So that on that market being opened, the freedom of ingress of cattle into the metropolis was again established, and the cattle from the scheduled countries were taken to the Deptford market?—That was so.

8. The next step, I think, was taking Schleswig-Holstein out of the schedule in 1872?—Schleswig and Holstein were taken out of the schedule, in July 1872, on an agreement or understanding which was entered into with the authorities of that district, amounting to the arrangement that no cattle should be imported into either Schleswig or Holstein from countries where cattle plague was likely to exist. The effect of the arrangement was, that cattle were not to be imported from Germany into those districts.

9. Cattle plague had been introduced from Germany into England by Russian cattle, had it not?—In 1865 it had, and that was the reason that the agreement was made.

10. Was one of the principal reasons for that, that the notice of disease that you received from Germany hardly ever arrived before the diseased animals themselves came?—I believe in each instance, that is to say, in 1869, in 1872, and in 1877, cattle affected with the disease, or cattle which had come from the districts in which the disease existed, were landed in this country before any intimation of the existence of the disease was received from the German Government. In 1869, we escaped an outbreak, but we got cattle from East Prussia after the cattle plague had broken out there.

Mr. *W. E. Forster.*

11. In 1872, although the cattle affected with the cattle plague were landed before we received any official intimation from the German Government, we had obtained, had we not, private information which gave us reasons to suspect it?—We had reasons to suspect it, and it was on that account, I apprehend, that only one animal in a cargo which had the disease was detected, the inspector having been warned to take extra care in his examination.

12. Which warning we had obtained by our own means of information, and it had not been conveyed to us by the German Government?—Precisely.

Chairman.

13. That does not affect the question which I asked, which was whether on more than one occasion the disease has not shown itself in this country before the official notification has been

Chairman—continued.

received of the disease having been discovered in the country from which the cattle were imported?—On two occasions, in 1872 and also in 1877, we had diseased animals brought into the country before we were aware of the existence of the disease abroad from official sources.

14. Can you describe how the disease that was imported then spread?—In 1872, although the animals affected with cattle plague were landed at Deptford, at Newcastle, at Hartlepool, and at Leith, we did not have the disease introduced into the interior of the country from those cargoes. No extension of the disease took place from those landing-places. In Hull a cargo of animals arrived in July 1872 from Russia, after importation of animals from that country had been prohibited by an Order of Council. The animals consequently were not landed, but were slaughtered on board the vessel, and sent out to sea. Notwithstanding the fact of the animals having been kept from the landing-place, cattle which were sold in the Hull market, on the following Monday, two days after the carcases were sent out to sea, took the disease into two districts in the East Riding of Yorkshire. It is therefore only possible to conclude that the infection here was conveyed by what is termed the mediate method. By the term "mediate contagion," which is constantly used in medical language, is meant the conveyance of infective matter by the agency of persons or things which have been in contact with diseased animals.

15. Notwithstanding the precautions which were then taken, the disease was communicated probably through the people who carried out the slaughter?—And possibly by drovers and persons who were on board the boat at the time that the animals came into the dock.

16. What measures were adopted at that time in consequence of that spread of the disease in Yorkshire?—As soon as the disease was discovered in the Pocklington district, an Order was passed prohibiting fairs and markets in the East Riding, and only permitting the removal of animals by license. On that occasion I may mention that when I arrived in the district where the disease existed, I found that all the animals had been slaughtered and buried.

Mr. *W. E. Forster.*

17. Do you mean merely the infected animals, or all the animals in the herd that was infected?—All in the one herd in the particular field, but there were three small herds in adjoining fields, and I represented to the local authorities at the time that if those herds could be slaughtered there was every reason to believe that the disease would be stamped out. There was no power vested in them by the provisions of the Act to order such slaughter, because the animals had not been in contact, and had not been in the same premises or in the same herd; and the owners refused to have them slaughtered, and consequently they were left alive. Two of those herds escaped; the other was attacked, and that circumstance kept the disease alive for three months in that district. At the time of my arrival, if the slaughter of those three herds, which amounted to about 30 animals, could have been carried out, there would have been no more cattle plague in the East Riding of Yorkshire, so far as I can judge.

18. Therefore

Chairman.

18. Therefore the result of that experience shows that it was not only necessary to take some measures with regard to animals absolutely connected or brought together in the same herd, but that any animals in a cordon surrounding that herd ought to be treated as infected?—The authorities having to deal with cattle plague should have power, as they have in Germany, to slaughter in any case in which they may be advised that it is necessary. There is no question of contact in Germany, it is simply a question of how far the slaughter should be extended, and what animals had been exposed to the infection.

19. The question is what circle will protect you, the disease having been disseminated?—Quite so.

20. As the result of that, were any measures taken for prohibiting importation from Russia of either cattle or manure?—Previously to the outbreak in the East Riding of Yorkshire, the importation of cattle and meat had been prohibited from Russia in consequence of the information which we had of the existence of the disease there; and sheep and goats were also scheduled, and they could only be landed for slaughter, and could not be landed at all if they were brought in the same vessel with cattle; and that Order still remains in force.

21. I understood you to say that the importation of cattle, manure, hoofs, and meat was prohibited from Russia?—The importation of cattle was strictly prohibited; meat can only be landed at certain ports where cattle are landed, and cannot be removed from the landing-place without a certificate of an inspector to the effect that it is not likely to introduce contagious disease.

22. Even when the meat comes over as a separate cargo?—Under any circumstances.

23. That Order remains in force at the present moment, I believe?—It does.

24. You said that sheep and goats were also put into the schedule; does that Order remain in force with regard to them?—It does.

25. And with regard to the German sheep and goats?—German sheep and goats have only lately been placed in the schedule in consequence of the recent outbreak of cattle plague. Previously to 1877, sheep and goats from Germany could be landed at undefined parts of ports, and after 12 hours' detention could be moved to any part of the country.

26. That was in consequence of the Order prohibiting their being removed in 1873, was it not?—German sheep were only scheduled during the time that cattle plague existed in Germany. German cattle have been scheduled from the time of the passing of the Act; but it was always believed that the danger of introducing cattle plague by means of sheep was so slight that it was not necessary to insist upon their slaughter at the landing-places. I may say that we have no instance of the introduction of the disease into this country in this century from abroad by means of sheep or goats.

27. Were the sheep removed from the schedule with regard to Schleswig-Holstein at the same time?—After the cessation of cattle plague in Germany, in January 1873, Schleswig and Holstein were removed from the schedule.

Mr. *W. E. Forster.*

28. The Schleswig-Holstein cattle were taken out of the schedule before the cattle plague was imported in 1872, were they not?—Shortly before.

29. Immediately after that import they were put back in the schedule?—Yes, in consequence of the outbreak of the cattle plague.

30. Were they again exempt from the schedule afterwards?—Schleswig and Holstein were again removed from the schedule in June 1873.

31. Are they still under the schedule?—The arrangement was modified when the Animals' Order of 1875 was passed. In that Order provision is made to exempt cattle from Schleswig and Holstein from the schedule, from the 23rd of June to the first week in December, so that at the end of June they will be absolutely out of the schedule; at present they are in the schedule. The order does not exempt them until the 24th day of June.

Chairman.

32. And that was by the Order of 1875?—The Animals' Order of 1875.

33. Were any regulations established at that time for the purpose of procuring information as to outbreaks of cattle plague on the continent?—Shortly after that time (I have not the exact date) an arrangement was made, resulting from discussions at several meetings of veterinary surgeons in Vienna, Zurich, and Hamburg, the whole result being that agreements were made with certain countries to insure early information by telegraph of the outbreak of cattle plague.

34. Has that been effective with regard to our recent experience?—It has not in any case. It has happened, I believe, in each instance when cattle plague has crossed the Polish frontier and got into the extreme eastern boundaries of Germany, that by the time the disease was discovered several animals had died. On the last occasion, in 1877, I think six animals had died. That, of course, means that the disease had existed for some time before it was discovered; and with the present facilities of transit, before the Government discovered the existence of the disease in Silesia, animals from the infected districts had gone right across the country.

35. We were deriving our supply so far south that the animals were carried through Germany and they arrived here, and the disease broke out before you were officially informed of any disease existing in the place from which they came?—That was so.

36. Precautions were taken also at landing-places, were they not, of the defined or undefined parts of ports?—The arrangements referring to animals from scheduled countries, which were then in force, and are now in force, are that they shall be detained for 12 hours and inspected, and at the expiration of the 12 hours they are slaughtered, and the slaughtermust be completed with 10 days. At those ports where animals from scheduled countries are landed arrangements are made for the purpose, as far as possible, of separating the defined part from the other parts of the port; but, as I have previously stated, the arrangements in all the ports are not nearly so satisfactory as they should be.

37. That was eminently the case with regard to certain ports as to which evidence was given

Professor *Brown.*

11 May 1877.

Chairman—continued.

before the previous Committee, I think?—It was. I may add that recently we have struck out several ports where the arrangements were incomplete, and where from peculiar circumstances they could not be improved to any extent, and we have induced the authorities at other ports to make arrangements which we considered satisfactory.

38. Has that been the case with regard to the port of Hull, as to which a good deal of evidence was given before?—The authorities at Hull propose to adopt certain arrangements which will considerably improve that port; but it is impossible to say, even with the arrangements which are now proposed, that the system will be quite satisfactory.

39. Those arrangements have not, as I understand from that answer, been carried out at the present moment?—They have not yet been carried out.

40. They were pointed out as defects in the system as far back as the last inquiry that took place, were they not?—They were.

41. I suppose you would represent to the Committee that the defects of your present system are very great with regard to your want of control over the landing of cattle?—Undoubtedly they are; and in reference to cattle plague in particular, the great difficulty is that we have no means of preventing the extension of the disease by mediate contagion. There are no means, for example, of stopping the movement of vessels, or of the persons that are on board those vessels.

42. You have no means of controlling the vessel after she has landed her cargo?—None whatever. The vessel has other cargo and passengers on board destined for some other landing place, and when animals are landed, for example at Deptford, as in the case of the cargo from the "Castor," we have positively to hunt out the vessel before we can take possession of it to insist upon the necessary disinfection.

43. Thus increasing the liability to the spread of the infection from people on board, or going on board, that vessel coming in contact with manure and other things that may be infected?—Quite so. This objection applies chiefly to cattle plague. That disease of all diseases to which animals are subject is the most readily conveyed by mediate contagion. It has been stated that we incur considerable risk of the conveyance of foot and mouth disease in the same way, but the evidence does not justify that conclusion at all.

44. You mean that the evidence does not show that foot and mouth disease is contagious in that way?—It does not show that it is conveyed by mediate contagion in the same way that cattle plague is.

45. Or pleuro-pneumonia?—Pleuro-pneumonia is least of all conveyed in that way.

46. I understood you to say that foot and mouth disease was not so readily conveyed?—It is not. I should like to illustrate it in this way: There are at the Brown Institute at this moment some eight or 10 animals which are placed there for the purpose of experiment. Mr. Duguid, who has charge of them, tried to induce foot and mouth disease by obtaining matter, which is always plentifully supplied at Deptford. He went backwards and forwards constantly, and took parts of animals, saliva, or anything he

Chairman—continued.

pleased, and tried to produce disease by the agency of this infective matter on those animals which he had under his charge; but he entirely failed to do it; and in no one instance did the experiment succeed. If he had tried the same thing with cattle plague it would not have been necessary for him to use any matter at all; he would simply have had to go among the diseased animals and then walk straight into his own place and go among the healthy ones; certainly in two or three visits of that kind he would have produced the disease. So that while I admit that foot and mouth disease may be conveyed by mediate contagion, I contend that the risk as compared with cattle plague is exceedingly slight.

47. What you represent is that it is only a difference in the risk; in the one case a very great, and in the other case only a slight risk is incurred?—Precisely.

48. Do I correctly understand you to say that with regard to pleuro-pneumonia that risk does not exist?—So far as the evidence which we are in possessien of goes, pleuro-pneumonia is never conveyed in that way; we have no proof, that is to say, that persons who have been attending on animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia are capable of conveying the disease to healthy herds. The history of the disease goes to show that it is not communicated in that way.

49. With regard to the present precautions, how do they protect the country from these diseases, looking at it in reference to the period of time which the diseases take to develop themselves?—My impression is that the present system protects us from foot and mouth disease as a rule. Owing to the short period of incubation, which commonly does not extend beyond 36 hours, the risk of the disease escaping the inspector's examination is very slight; and this is proved by the circumstance that it is not uncommon for one or two animals in a thousand to be detected. This at the same time shows to my mind that the inspection is conscientiously performed; and, further, it proves the proposition with which I started, viz., that the disease is almost certain to be developed, more or less during the time that the animals are coming from the country from which they are sent, plus the 12 hours' detention; but I am in possession of evidence which convinces me that occasionally infected animals do escape detection, and that to a certain extent we do add to the number of centres of infection of foot and mouth disease by means of infected animals from abroad. This remark applies chiefly to pigs; swine do not show the disease so markedly as other animals, and they are more likely to escape the inspector's notice than either sheep or cattle; they are more difficult to examine.

50. Does the same period of incubation of the disease exist with them as with other animals?—As nearly as possible; the period of incubation may be taken as from 36 hours to four or five days.

51. That is about the time, is it not, within which cattle plague in general develops itself?—The incubation period of cattle plague will vary from four days to seven days.

52. With regard to pleuro-pneumonia, I believe that takes a very much longer time to develop itself?—To take the extremes, we may say,

Chairman—continued.

say, that it takes from three weeks to as many months.

53. So that it is almost impossible, by the system of quarantine or inspection, to protect yourself against the disease, or at least to detect the disease?—It is absolutely impossible, so far as any system of quarantine is concerned.

54. Are there any improvements of the system that you would suggest by which the protection may be strengthened?—I think it would probably be advisable to refrain from entering into any details at this stage of the examination, as the whole question of the prevention of the extension of the disease in this country is so connected with foreign importation, that the two, I think, should be taken together.

55. Will you tell the Committee what the particulars are with regard to the recent outbreak of cattle plague?—We had the first intelligence of cattle plague in Germany by a telegram dated 9th January, which intimated that an outbreak had occurred in Silesia, and that several animals had died.

56. Did that telegram state that several animals had died of cattle plague?—Yes.

57. From whom did you receive the telegram?—I am not quite certain whether it came from our consul or from the German government, but it was the ordinary official form.

58. It was an official intimation of the outbreak of cattle plague?—It was an official intimation of the outbreak.

Mr. *W. E. Forster.*

59. Do you remember whether it came from our consul at the port, he having been informed by the German authorities, or whether the German authorities had sent information to the German embassy here?—The information was sent by the German authorities.

Chairman.

60. Will you tell the Committee how the whole of the facts occurred in their proper order?—It was something like a month or six weeks before we found out at what time the animals which brought the disease here were really shipped. Immediately on receiving the official notice, the usual course was adopted of sending a telegram to all the port inspectors, warning them that cattle plague had broken out in Germany, and requesting them to be very careful in their examinations. This was merely a formal proceeding; at the time we did not apprehend that cattle plague would extend, because it is very common for Germany to have an outbreak of cattle plague on the eastern frontier and to stamp it out at once, and no interference with the trade takes place; they do not even stop a market.

61. Have you, on more than one occasion, had notifications of cattle plague breaking out in Germany without our suffering from it?—We have on several occasions.

Mr. *W. E. Forster.*

62. What part of Silesia did you hear it was in?—It was in the Oppeln district.

63. Near the Polish frontier?—Close to the Polish frontier. The next intimation which we had was on Monday the 15th January, when a notice appeared in the public papers of the appearance of cattle plague at Altona.

Mr. *W. H. Forster*—continued.

Chairman.

64. Had you no information from the consul of that outbreak?—Not at that time. This notice I read at ten o'clock in the morning, and at the same moment the "Castor" landed her cattle at Deptford. That was the ship that brought 39 animals, all of them affected with the disease, some of them dying of it; one of them died on the shoot as it was been driven from the ship.

Mr. *W. E. Forster.*

65. Where did the ship come from?—From Hamburg.

Chairman.

66. And you had no knowledge of this outbreak previously to seeing it in the public journals?—We had no official notice of the outbreak in Hamburg until, I believe, 12 o'clock of the same day, that is two hours after the animals were landed at Deptford.

67. Did you know in any way that this vessel was bringing a cargo over from that port?—We did not.

68. You had no intelligence at all of the shipment?—None whatever. The consignor had intelligence that the ship was arriving in the ordinary course, but that was merely in the common way of the trade, and, of course, we should have had no notice of the kind.

69. Did you, after your knowledge of it through the public press, receive any official notification of it?—Not of the shipment of these animals in the "Castor." All the information which has been obtained relative to that shipment has been obtained from private sources.

70. In fact, at the time when you saw the notice in the papers, you were unaware of the existence of the disease at Altona, and you were unaware of the fact of this vessel having started with a cargo?—Quite.

71. How did you become aware of the disease breaking out on board the "Castor"?—Subsequently to the landing of the animals at Deptford, an inquiry was made, and it was ascertained that cattle plague was declared to exist in certain stables in Hamburg on the 13th of January. The animals which were sent to Deptford and to Hull were shipped on the previous day.

72. Were they from the same herd of cattle?—They were shipped from the same stables, where cattle plague was discovered on the following morning.

73. In the one case in the vessel "Castor," and in the other case in the "Hansa"?—Yes.

74. When did you receive from Hamburg the official notification of it?—We had no official notification from Hamburg of the leaving of those vessels. The official information of the existence of cattle plague in Hamburg was received on the day of the landing of the cargo at Deptford.

75. But after the cattle had landed?—Two hours after the cattle had landed.

76. Then your inspector at the port was the first to inform you of the fact of the disease existing on board the "Castor," at Deptford?—He was.

 77. What

Professor *Brown.*

11 May 1877.

Chairman—continued.

77. What action was then taken at Deptford?—Directions were at once given for the slaughter of the whole of the animals; the block in which they were placed was declared an infected place, and was locked up; and precautions were then taken to prevent any persons who were in contact with the diseased animals from leaving the place without being properly disinfected. But up to that time there were over a dozen customs officers, and more than that, that number of drovers and other persons engaged about the animals both on board the vessel and after they were landed; of course all those men had moved freely in any direction, as at the time there was no reason to suspect the existence of disease.

78. The disease had not been reported until after the vessel had been inspected by the Custom House officers?—No.

79. When you did take action, were you able entirely to disinfect and control the people who visited that ship?—As far as it was possible we did so; but it will be quite apparent that there are great difficulties in dealing with such men as drovers and slaughtermen who are about the cattle, who are always literally saturated with blood and dirt of all kinds; and, short of literally stripping them and thoroughly washing them, and burning all their clothes, there is no possibility of anything like perfect disinfection.

80. Did not that vessel leave the place for the purpose of unloading other cargo?—The vessel went to some landing-place in London with passengers, and then went on to Horsleydown for the purpose of unloading the rest of the cargo.

81. So that you had no further control over her?—Not until cattle plague was discovered in Deptford Market, and then inquiries were at once made as to the whereabouts of the vessel, and one of the travelling inspectors was instructed to take the necessary means to ensure its being perfectly disinfected.

82. But in the meantime she had the opportunity of spreading the disease at various points in London?—Undoubtedly. Considering the facility with which persons could go on board, and considering further the fact that all the animals were carried on the deck, it is a somewhat remarkable circumstance that the disease was not more extensively spread in London than it was.

83. It points to the risk that is run in all these cases of importation under the present restrictions?—Undoubtedly.

84. Had the vessel a full cargo of cattle, or did she come over with only a certain number of cattle and a general cargo?—She started with only 40 cattle on the deck; one of those died, and was thrown overboard on the way, and 39 were landed, one of them dying on the landing-place before it could be got into the lairs.

85. So that the disease had completely developed itself during the voyage?—There cannot be the slightest question that the disease was well developed in some of the animals before they were shipped.

86. The "Castor" arrived on the 15th, and you got the official notification two hours after you had seen it in the newspapers?—That is so.

87. What precautions were taken with regard to the outbreak at Hull, which took place from the same shed?—In the case of Hull, there was no suspicion at all of animals having been landed at that port from the infected sheds at Altona, until one of the travelling inspectors, Mr. Courtney, who had charge of the "Castor" during the disinfection, heard a remark from one of the persons on board to this effect: "I wonder what they have done with the other lot that went to Hull?" On being informed of this circumstance, I made inquiries, which occupied something like a week or 10 days, and I ascertained finally that the same man who had sent 40 animals in the "Castor" to Deptford had also sent 18 animals in the "Hansa" to Hull. Those animals on being examined by the inspector were found, some of them at least, to be suffering from foot and mouth disease. It was some time afterwards, in fact not until the outbreak occurred in Hull, that we ascertained, on inquiry in the district, that two of these animals, in addition to being affected with foot and mouth disease, had shown symptoms of some more serious malady, which had induced the inspector to have them slaughtered at once. He states that there was in his mind at the time no suspicion of cattle plague, and he failed to recognise the disease in his post-mortem examination of those two animals; but from the description which he has given of the symptoms and appearance of the animals, added to the evidence which we have obtained as to the origin of the animals, of which he was at the time quite ignorant, there can be little or no doubt that these two animals were the subjects of cattle plague.

88. Following your usual course, did you issue a circular to the authorities at that time?—On the 17th January, a circular was prepared and sent at once warning the local authorities all over the country of the possibility of cattle plague having escaped from the metropolis.

89. That was before you had taken any step to investigate the matter?—Instantly, on the discovery of the disease.

90. What further steps did you take with regard to the importation of animals from foreign countries?—The importation of cattle, meat, and hides from Germany and Belgium was prohibited on January the 27th, in consequence of the information which was received of the continued spread of the disease in that country.

91. Subsequently to your first intelligence you had information that the disease had not been stamped out, but that it was spreading through Germany?—Subsequently to the first announcement of the disease at Altona, I ascertained from private sources, that on the day of the discovery of the outbreak in Silesia, animals from that district were standing in the Berlin market, and on the following Wednesday some of them were standing in the market at Hamburg. That was long before the German government was aware of infected animals having left that district.

92. That was before we got any intelligence here of the breaking out of the disease?—It was.

93. On the 27th January you prohibited the importation of cattle, meat, and hides, from those countries?—From Germany and Belgium.

94. Why did you include Belgium as well as Germany?—On account of Belgium being chiefly a country of transit. We knew, of course, that if we stopped live cattle coming from Germany, it would be the simplest thing in the world to send them through Belgium. We prohibited meat

Chairman—continued.

meat from Hamburg chiefly on account of the information which we had that they were slaughtering a great many animals there, and we thought it extremely probable that, before the disease was discovered in other places, they would kill all the diseased animals and send them over to us; and coming in the form of carcases, we should not, of course, know whether they were diseased or healthy so long as the meat was in good condition.

95. Besides Germany and Belgium, was France included in that circular?—France was already scheduled, and we did not think it necessary to prohibit the importation of cattle from France.

96. But up to that time, sheep and goats had been coming in from those countries; were they scheduled then?—They were scheduled, that is to say, they could only be landed in ports where provision was made for slaughtering them.

97. And that was in the same Order of the 27th January?—I believe it was not included in that Order, as sheep and goats were already scheduled.

98. The disease was reported again, I think, on the 30th January?—On the 30th January one of our inspectors informed me that he had seen some animals in a dairy in Limehouse which he believed to be suffering from cattle plague.

99. Was that belief confirmed afterwards, or what took place?—On receiving this information, the chief inspector was requested to make an inquiry. It was in the evening when he made his visit. I arranged to meet him early on the following morning, in order to get his report, and he informed me that he was satisfied that the disease was cattle plague. I immediately went to the shed and inspected the animals, and found that nearly all of them were suffering.

100. Were there peculiar symptoms about them?—The symptoms were in many respects peculiar. There was, for instance, an entire absence of those indications in the mouth which are always looked upon as most characteristic, and there was a peculiarity also in the temperature; instead of finding an elevated temperature in the majority of the animals, some of them were below the normal temperature, and others were very little above it; but from the aspect of the animals altogether, and from the fact that no other disease could possibly produce so much damage in the same space of time, there was no doubt left on my mind that the disease was true rinderpest.

101. You satisfied yourself that it was a fresh outbreak of cattle plague?—I had no doubt about it, and particularly I arrived at the conclusion from the fact which I remembered, viz., that an affection of the same type and form of cattle plague, identical with this, had appeared in the east of London in 1867, and at that time it was the subject of remark, that some of the characteristic symptoms were entirely absent.

102. The same symptoms, or rather the same want of symptoms, had been shown in the last outbreak of cattle plague?—They had.

103. As a result, did the department do anything at once upon that discovery?—Immediately on the discovery of the disease, an Order was passed prohibiting the movement of cattle, sheep, and goats out of the metropolis.

104. A cordon was drawn round the metropolis?—A cordon was drawn round the metropolis.

105. Similarly to the course which was adopted in the first outbreak?—Similarly to the course which was adopted in the first outbreak.

106. Have you formed any opinion as to how this disease could have been conveyed to the Limehouse shed?—We ascertained that several of the drovers, and also the customs officers, who were on board the vessel, lived in that district; and we have ascertained quite recently that a drover removed a cow from the shed in Limehouse where the disease occurred, to which I have just referred, on the same day of the landing of the "Castor's" cargo at Deptford. The individual refuses to admit that he was at Deptford on that day; but he goes so far as to say that he was in company with a man who had just come from there. He moved a cow from this shed on that day, and it is further stated that he went into the shed and untied the cow himself.

107. That points rather to connecting it with the diseased cattle at Deptford?—There can be no question, I think, that the disease was conveyed from Deptford in some such way.

108. Very soon after that, I think, the department prohibited all markets in the metropolis, except by license?—By Order of Council of the 2nd February, markets and sales in the metropolis were prohibited except by license, and at the same time licenses were issued for the holding of the Metropolitan Market and for the holding of the Deptford Market.

109. In consequence of this, I think, you also sent out another circular from the department to the country?—We sent out a circular warning them that it was believed that some animals had escaped from the metropolis. There was reason at that time to apprehend that the thing had really taken place.

110. You mean that animals that had been in contact with those diseased beasts had been removed from the metropolis?—It was ascertained that some of the dairies in the east of London had been entirely emptied, and it was admitted that the cows had been sent to the Metropolitan Market. Therefore, it was a fair presumption that the animals had been removed from the sheds in consequence of an outbreak of some disease which was suspected to be cattle plague; because a dairyman would not remove all his stock on any other plea; and therefore it was also assumed that some of those animals might by chance have been taken to some other parts of the country from the Metropolitan Market before the discovery of the disease.

111. In consequence of that supposition, this fresh circular was issued to the authorities?—It was.

112. The cattle plague broke out next in Essex, did it not?—It extended to Essex; that is to say, it crossed the metropolitan boundary on the 10th February.

113. Where did that first appear?—It first appeared in Stratford.

114. Was that in a market, or in a dairy shed?—In a dairy shed.

115. Was any Order passed then by the local authorities?—An Order was passed by the Lords of the Privy Council on the 10th February, giving power to the local authorities to prohibit

Professor *Brown.*

11 May 1877.

Chairman—continued.

or regulate the movement of cattle in their districts, and to prohibit the holding of markets except by license.

116. Did the Stratford outbreak spread?—The disease extended to several dairies in the same districts; but, excepting in two cases, which are of a very doubtful character, it did not reach to any distance from the metropolitan boundary.

117. Did the local authority take any action under the Order of the Privy Council enabling them to prohibit the movement of cattle and the holding of markets in a certain number of petty sessional divisions. The line which they drew extended as far as Thames Haven.

188. And no further outbreak has taken place there, I believe, since that?—Not since that.

119. Then the disease showed next at Hull, did it not?—It was discovered for the first time in the dairies at Hull on the 17th February.

120. Is that what you referred to just now as having been discovered subsequently to the cargo from the "Hansa" having been distributed?—It was. I may add that, on an inquiry being made, it was found that several dairymen had got rid of their stock, so that the long interval between the landing of the cargo on the 14th January, and the discovery of the disease on the 17th February, more than a month, would be easily filled up by the occurrence of cases which had been concealed, the animals having been got rid of.

121. Do you mean by that that the animals were slaughtered for food?—We failed to ascertain what was done with the animals. The owners asserted, as they always do, that they were sent to the butchers, and the results go to prove that their statements were correct; because if they had sent them into the Hull Market and then had been taken over the country, there is no doubt that we should have had outbreaks in various parts.

122. You failed to trace, in reality, how that cargo was distributed; but you believe, in consequence of the disease not spreading, that most of them had gone into the market for slaughter?—The particular cargo from the "Hansa" was accounted for. Necessarily, coming from Germany, the animals must be slaughtered in the defined part. The stock of cows which were removed from the dairies in Hull, before the disease was discovered, were not traced; but in consequence of there being no outbreak of disease in the East Riding, I am led to believe that they were really all slaughtered, as the owners stated.

123. You sent an inspector down at once, I believe, on this outbreak taking place at Hull?—The chief inspector was at once instructed to proceed there, and Captain Tennant, one of the travelling inspectors, took charge of the district, practically on behalf of the department, for the purpose of making inquiries for our own information, not of course with the idea of interfering with the action of the local authorities.

124. You advised the local authorities, I suppose, with regard to the action which they ought to take?—We advised them through the chief inspector, and also through Captain Tennant.

125. Did they take action at once upon that?—They immediately directed an inspection of all the dairies in Hull, and an Order was passed by

Chairman—continued.

the Lords of the Council prohibiting the holding of fairs and markets in the East Riding.

126. Was that effectual in preventing the spread, or did the disease continue in Hull?—The disease continued until March the 22nd.

127. How did it show itself during that time?—Solely in the dairies.

128. It broke out in more than one of the dairies, did it not?—In six dairies in Hull.

129. Those circumstances followed each other in succession up to the 22nd March?—Yes. In reference to the origin of the disease here, I may state, for the information of the Committee, that Captain Tennant gained what he considered to be reasonable evidence that the dairy-keepers in Hull are in the habit of buying the surplus fodder, which is brought over in the ships which convey foreign cattle.

130. And, therefore, some of the surplus fodder that came over in the ship with the diseased cattle may have been so bought?—It is possible. I do not quite understand what they mean by "litter," because foreign animals do not really have "litter" under them, but something in the way of hay or straw is said to be habitually bought by the dairymen of Hull and used as "litter" for their cattle.

131. Entailing a certain risk in case it has been on board the vessel?—Unquestionably. In short it is an action of which one would not have accused any sane man.

132. The next step was the appearance of the cattle plague in Lincolnshire, was it not?—Cattle plague appeared in Lincolshire in one farm, near Great Grimsby, some time after the outbreak in Hull.

133. That was on the 8th March, was it not?—It was.

134. Did it extend beyond that farm?—It did not extend beyond the farm where it first appeared.

135. Did the local authorities take the same precautions as they had taken in Yorkshire?—They acted under the Order, to a certain extent, prohibiting fairs and markets in certain portions of the county; but subsequently, owing to a representation from some of the local authorities, an Order was passed by the Privy Council prohibiting fairs and markets in the whole of the East Riding. That Order still remains in force.

136. The disease has not spread, I think, in that county at all since that?—It has not.

137. To go back to the metropolis, we come next to the extension of the disease to Willesden, do we not?—That information was received at the Privy Council Office in the first week in April, on the 7th April, the statement being that the animals were seen to be diseased on the previous day.

138. What was the history of that outbreak?—It was ascertained during our inquiry, which lasted several weeks (because in all these cases the information which is obtained is got by degrees, and only by perpetual cross-questioning), that the owner of the herd had given notice of the existence of the disease on the 2nd of April, which was Easter Monday. During the night one of his cows died; the inspector of the district attended on the following morning, on the Tuesday, and made a post mortem examination, that was on the 3rd; he states, that the result of this examination did not suggest to his mind the existence

Chairman—continued.

existence of cattle plague. The owner, on the other hand, states that he was so convinced that it was cattle plague, that he told the inspector that if he did not give notice to the authorities he should do it himself. No notice, however, appears to have been given until Saturday morning, the 7th. On that day the inspector communicated with the clerk of the peace for Middlesex, and immediately on receiving the information, the representative of the clerk of the peace came to the Veterinary Department with the inspector and gave me the information.

139. So that the outbreak, whatever it was, was in existence from the 3rd up to the 7th, before you were aware of it?—Undoubtedly; and meanwhile, if the owner had so chosen, there was no law to prevent him sending his animals to any part of Scotland or anywhere else.

140. They might have been distributed all over the country during that interval?—All over the country.

141. What was the action taken by the local authorities as soon as knowledge of the facts was made public?—The clerk of the peace gave instructions in my presence on the 7th of April to the effect that if the chief inspector decided that the disease was cattle plague, all the diseased animals should be slaughtered. The inspector did decide that it was cattle plague; in fact, there was no question about the matter; and some 15 animals were slaughtered and buried on the Saturday night, the 7th. On the Sunday morning, I went to Willesden with the chief inspector, and in walking through the sheds, I counted some 25 animals suffering from the disease in its most advanced stage.

142. Was that subsequently to the 15 having been buried?—The 15 had then just been buried. The local authority met on the Monday, and this is one of the difficulties which we have to contend with in reference to local authorities; that no one appears to have the power to order the slaughter of animals that have been in contact with diseased ones. The clerk of the peace had not such power, and he was required to communicate with his local authority. The outbreak was detected on the Saturday, Sunday intervened, and no meeting could take place until the Monday morning. When they did meet, the action which they adopted was most prompt; the slaughter of all the herd was ordered, the place was declared for a mile round an infected place, notice was given to the adjoining occupiers, and all that was suggested by the Veterinary Department was adopted. Among other things I advised that nothing but the meat of healthy animals should be removed, that the hides and offal in each case should be buried; and this recommendation was adopted at once.

143. Were people allowed to go in and out freely during that time?—I believe that directions were issued that persons going into the place should not be allowed to leave unless they were disinfected, but I am aware that those orders were not carried into effect.

144. It is very difficult, I suppose, to enforce an order of that sort?—It is exceedingly difficult for the local authority to enforce an order of that kind with a very limited staff.

145. The Act at present gives all the power to the local authority, does it not?—It gives in-

Chairman—continued.

deed the whole details of the management of an outbreak into their hands. In this particular instance, the defects of that system became painfully apparent. The inspector who had to deal with this outbreak has a practice which extends many miles round the place where he lives, viz.: Hanwell. It is known that he went from the diseased animals on the Saturday night to examine some other animals in the same district which were said to be affected with pleuro-pneumonia; he was accompanied by the valuer, whose business it was to value animals affected either with pleuro-pneumonia or with cattle plague. It is simply impossible to conceive any more likely method of communicating the disease to an indefinite extent than this system which I have just described.

146. In fact, the very agents of the local authority were probably the means of carrying the disease?—Probably, though as far as we can judge in the cases which have come under our notice, they did not convey the disease.

147. But at the same time the liability exists, and in its strongest form?—Undoubtedly; and there is the fact that the disease did spread in the Willesden district to places where it is at least probable that persons who were concerned about the diseased animals on this farm were in the habit of visiting.

148. Even though the disease may not in this instance have been conveyed by the inspector of the local authority, I understood you just now to say that to your knowledge many people had been in and out on the ground where those diseased animals were without any precaution being taken?—That is the case. On the morning of my arrival there, on the Sunday, I saw in the yard, close to the sheds, a butcher, who had heard of the outbreak as soon as we had, and was there prepared to take as many animals as he could get consigned to him; he was present with some assistant, and he had a pony and cart standing in the yard, the man and the horse having their feet covered to the depth of some inches with the manure which was scattered all over the place. They would certainly have gone out without any disinfection if I had not insisted that, before they did leave, they should rub their boots well with lime, which I saw brought for the purpose; and that very imperfect disinfection was all that could be carried out at the time, simply from the absence of any other means.

149. You think that that points to the inability of the local authority, with its present regulations, to deal with such a case?—Quite so.

150. Do you think that their knowledge of the laws which govern disease is sufficiently sound to enable them to deal with it?—I do not. It appears to me that local authorities cannot reasonably be expected to know how to deal with outbreaks of contagious disease. They may be asked to carry out certain detailed directions which are written for them in Acts or Orders, but they cannot possibly deal with emergencies as they arise.

151. And besides, they want the machinery for carrying them out?—They want the machinery as much as they want the necessary knowledge.

152. And I suppose the Department generally get blamed for all the errors committed by the local authority in these cases?—So far as I can judge

Professor *Brown.*

11 May 1877.

Chairman—continued.

judge from what I read and hear, the popular impression is, that all the measures relating to dealing with contagious and infectious diseases are carried out under the immediate direction of the Veterinary Department. So far from this being the case, we are absolutely not in a position to obtain knowledge of the details of measures which are adopted, unless we go beyond our present machinery for the purpose of getting that knowledge; I mean in reference to inquiries which are absolutely indispensable for the information of the Government. The chief inspector, of course, is only available for the investigation of one outbreak at one time. Three of the travelling inspectors, Mr. Courtney, Captain Tennant, and Mr. Ricketts, in compliance with my request, very kindly volunteered to give their assistance; and I should like to say that unless they had worked as they have done, frequently stopping up all night for the purpose of seeing that the measures which were suggested were carried out, I do not imagine that we should have been able to deal with the cattle plague even as well as we have.

153. Have you yourself taken any steps to represent to the Department alterations that would be necessary in consequence of this recent outbreak?—I pointed out to the Lord President the difficulties which the local authorities were labouring under, and the very great risk that the disease would be spread to a serious extent unless some change took place; and by his Grace's direction I wrote a memorandum which was sent to all the local authorities.

154. What were the suggestions which you made in that memorandum as improvements on the existing state of things?—I suggested that the local authority had power to prohibit the entry of persons into premises where cattle plague exists, and I advised that they should act under that power; I also suggested that it was their duty to cause the cleansing and disinfection of any premises where cattle plague existed, or had existed, and to destroy or effectually dispose of manure, litter, and other articles that had been in contact with or used about any diseased animal. Further, it was suggested that they had power to direct the disinfection of the clothes of persons who had been engaged about diseased animals: and I also suggested that the provisions would include slaughtermen, milkers, and the apparatus used by them, and even persons bringing fodder into a yard or shed, or removing manure from those places. I also advised a periodical inspection of all the dairies in the districts where cattle plague existed or had recently appeared. Further, I advised that the carcase of a diseased animal should be effectually disinfected, and also, when practicable, that it should be buried; if not, that it should be moved, as must be done in the crowded London districts, in a closed conveyance in charge of an officer of the local authority, who should superintend its destruction. Further (which I considered to be most important), it was suggested that the apparently healthy cattle should be killed and dressed on the premises, the hides and offal being disinfected before being removed. Upon this suggestion I laid great stress, from the circumstance which had come to my knowledge, that animals in the earlier stage of the disease had been removed to slaughter-houses and dressed for human food. On one occasion

Chairman—continued.

the chief inspector saw animals affected with the disease in a dairy in the east of London; and he subsequently saw the majority of those animals hanging up as carcases dressed for food in a butcher's shop, not very far from the shed where the disease occurred. The same thing happened in the outbreak at Shepherd's Bush; a number of animals, said to be not healthy but fit for human food (that seems to be the test), were taken to a slaughter-house in the neighbourhood, and a gentleman who had seen cattle plague, or what he believed to be cattle plague, in China, having heard of this circumstance, went to the slaughter-house and wrote me a description of the morbid appearances which he saw in the organs of the animals which the butchers had killed for food; and his description was a clear description of the morbid appearances of cattle plague.

155. There was no doubt, then, that those animals had got the disease?—There was not the slightest question that the animals were suffering from the disease in such a stage that every particle of their bodies was capable of communicating the disease to other animals if brought in contact with them.

156. Would that be the case even when dead?—Certainly; that has been proved by experiment.

157. That is to say, the meat of the dead animal, if infected with the disease, will convey that disease by contact?—It will; but what is more serious, the persons who were engaged in slaughtering those animals are likely to convey the disease, and I account for the outbreak at Willesden upon that principle. That man at Shepherd's Bush, who had diseased animals from the dairy in which cattle plague broke out there, was in the habit of going to the farm at Willesden for the purpose of taking animals which were suffering from pleuro-pneumonia, and other animals which the owner thought it desirable to have slaughtered on account of their being fit for the butcher, or from the fear that the pleuro-pneumonia might extend to them. It is admitted that this person did pay visits to that farm in the ordinary course of his business; if he had gone from the slaughter-house where those animals were killed on to the Willesden farm on that same day or the day afterwards, the outbreak on Easter Monday would be accounted for. We have no proof that he did go, and he asserts that he did not.

158. At the same time there would be the possibility of its being so conveyed?—Quite so.

159. I suppose the destruction of the manure in those places would be an absolute necessity?—Undoubtedly, although I believe the risk of conveying cattle plague by means of manure is considerably overrated. So long as it can be conveyed to land and ploughed in, I do not apprehend that there is much risk of any infection being communicated by its means; but as a matter of common precaution it is absolutely necessary that the manure should be disinfected and destroyed. That necessity has given rise to an enormous difficulty in dealing with the manure, according to the provisions of the Act, in the metropolis and in towns generally. Probably the greater part of the abuse which has been lavished on the Veterinary Department has

taken

Chairman—continued.

taken the direction of complaints about the movement of manure out of the metropolis. We have been over and over again requested to prohibit the movement of manure, not from an infected place (which is done by the Act), but from the metropolitan district; in fact we have been asked to do what is simply impossible, to do what, in fact, was proved to be impossible during the outbreak in 1865. It happened that, owing to a misinterpretation of the orders that were issued, the local authorities round London made regulations to prevent the movement of manure from the metropolitan district into their districts. The result was that in the course of a week or ten days the sanitary officers took very strong measures, and insisted, in short, that the manure should be removed, and I was instructed at the time to make an inquiry. In the course of my investigations, in the midst of the city, about Shoreditch, Paddington, and other places, I saw sights which cannot possibly be described by any terms which I could employ; I saw heaps of rotting manure considerably higher than the tops of the houses in which the people were living; and, as a result of this, it became immediately necessary to inform the local authorities that they had no power to prohibit the movement of manure out of London, and to take steps for its instant removal.

160. What steps were taken?—It was allowed to go in all directions at all risks; it was taken away by barges and carts everywhere.

161. What recommendation did you make in your memorandum with regard to the future dealing with manure?—We recommend that the manure from an infected place shall be rendered as harmless as possible by being mixed with its own weight of quicklime.

162. Do you believe that that would destroy any danger of the spread of the disease?—My impression is that it would, but of course we were not justified in incurring the risk, however slight, and therefore it was further suggested that after this disinfection the manure should be burned, or otherwise in some way destroyed.

163. Burnt, I suppose?—Burnt if possible; we disposed of a great deal of manure at Willesden by burning.

164. Do you suppose that you could enforce any regulation of that sort, which would imply that after a man had taken the precautions which you suggest for disinfecting a thing, he should still take further precautions by destroying it?—We could only enforce it by doing the work ourselves, as we have done at Willesden since the Order was passed giving power to the Privy Council to take action.

165. That would lead them to the central department in all cases taking the control?—Yes; in the case of the metropolis we found it simply impossible to carry into effect the provisions of the Act which prohibit the movement of manure from infected places out of the metropolis, because it would have compelled us to keep the manure in those infected places. That was done until the medical officers very properly interfered, and requested that we should take it away; and, in order to get rid of it, we carted it away into barges, and took it out to sea, and threw it overboard.

166. I suppose those suggestions that you

Chairman—continued.

made would entail a reorganisation of the department; you could not carry out these additional restrictions without a larger staff than you have at present?—No; we should have to take the place of the local authority all over the country.

167. That would require a very large staff, would it not?—It would require a very large staff; I believe something like 2,000 inspectors would be necessary. Under the local authorities there are 1,700 or 1,800, and I consider their staff very insufficient.

168. You would, in fact, assume for the central authority the appointment of all inspectors throughout the country?—Certainly.

169. To go back to the course of proceedings: having traced what you did after the Willesden case, which was on April the 7th and the following days, what next occurred?—On the 11th of April, in consequence of the continued existence of the cattle plague, deputations from the Royal Agricultural Society, and also from the Shorthorn Society, had an interview with the Lord President, and represented to him the importance of the Government at once taking charge of cattle plague in the metropolitan police district, or, as they termed it, in the home counties. On the following day, the 12th of April, an Order was passed giving the Privy Council power to deal with the cattle plague in the whole of the metropolitan police district.

170. Did that come into force immediately?—It came into force on the 16th of April.

171. Was that restricted to cattle plague, or did it supersede the local authority in other matters?—It was restricted entirely to cattle plague.

172. Had you under that Order to appoint inspectors?—We appointed 12 inspectors, who were placed under the direction of the three travelling inspectors who had acted all along; Captain Tennant took four men under his charge in the Willesden district; Mr. Courtney took four men under his charge in one part of the East of London; and Mr. Ricketts took four under his charge in another part of the East of London.

173. What instructions were given to those inspectors?—They were instructed to make inquiries at all the dairies and dairy farms for the purpose of ascertaining the sanitary state of the animals in those places; they were cautioned not to insist upon entering premises or examining animals unless there was reason to suspect disease; they were told to provide themselves with waterproof clothing, including coverings for their boots; and they were distinctly cautioned not to move from any premises where they discovered cattle plague to exist until they were relieved. The working of that system was this: If an inspector found cattle plague, he telegraphed to the Veterinary Department; he remained at the place until the chief inspector had made his visit; and, if cattle plague was confirmed, he took charge of the herd and stopped at that particular point until the animals were disposed of, and the premises were perfectly cleansed and disinfected.

174. Had he power to prohibit ingress?—He had no such power; but his instructions were not to allow persons to go out who insisted

Professor *Brown.*

11 May 1877.

Chairman—continued.

on coming in, unless they submitted to a process of disinfection; and I particularly directed that all persons who did enter such premises, and wished to leave them again, should have their boots thoroughly sponged with chloride of lime solution, and then covered with quick lime, and that they should be dressed from head to foot with chloride of lime and water. One man at Bayswater refused to submit to this, and his name is now before the Treasury for prosecution.

175. Was that a man employed about the place?—No, he had no business there at all; he came in as a matter of curiosity.

176. Did he come from a scientific point of view as a matter of curiosity, or merely as one of the ordinary public?—He did not give any reason for his entrance.

177. Was he a veterinary surgeon?—He was described as a farrier and the owner of a forge in the neighbourhood.

178. Your regulations prohibit also the removal of the hides and offal, do they not?—They do. This appears to be an excess of precaution, because hides could be rendered perfectly harmless by a preliminary process of dressing; but as we hoped not to have to deal with any very large number of animals, it was thought safer, and at any rate more simple, to put them at once underground.

179. So that your regulations, in fact, were even stricter, perhaps, than was necessary in order to make quite sure of the prevention of the spread of the disease?—In that particular they certainly were.

180. I understood you to say that a good deal of the meat of those animals found its way into the market; is it easy to detect meat that comes from a diseased animal as compared with the ordinary meat that is hung there?—Under certain conditions it is simply impossible. I have seen meat from animals affected with the disease presenting all the appearance of perfectly healthy beef of the very first class. I saw, during the outbreak of 1865, Scotch animals in the metropolitan market slaughter-houses showing all the characteristic signs of the disease; I saw them slaughtered, I saw the meat dressed and hung up, and I examined it on the following day for the purpose of ascertaining whether I could discover any indication which would enable me to say that the meat was that of an animal affected with the cattle plague, and I found that I could not. The meat was sent to market and fetched its full price; so that it is quite evident that the meat inspector could not.

181. Were those animals in which the disease had been developed before they were slaughtered?—In these cases the disease was fully developed.

182. I understood you to say just before to have stated that a gentleman, I think from abroad, went and viewed certain pieces of meat hanging up, and that from what he saw of the meat so hanging, he described symptoms which led you to say that the animal had died of cattle plague?—No, that was from the examination of the organs of the animals, and not from the meat.

183. From the meat you would not be able to detect the disease?—Not in these cases, but where the disease is very far advanced there are certain conditions of meat which would lead you

Chairman—continued.

to suspect. It becomes what the butchers call "fiery," assuming a very dark red colour, and there is emphysema, or extravasation of air under the tissues of the back and shoulders; but those conditions are only present in very extreme cases.

184. There are no conditions which would lead you to be sure that the meat of those animals would be condemned as unfit for human food?—Not on account of cattle plague; but animals, I will not say healthy, but perfectly free from cattle plague, may be, and constantly are condemned as unfit for food, simply from the circumstance that they are in a state of debility; and under those conditions, the meat remains damp, and has a most unwholesome look, and is probably more unwholesome than the meat of an animal in first-rate condition, which is at the same time subject to cattle plague. The inspectors were instructed to condemn all animals so diseased, if there was an increase of temperature, which is the earliest signs of the existence of plague.

185. I suppose you mean a sudden increase of temperature?—A sudden increase of temperature; without some such test, we were not authorised in returning animals as affected with disease, and consequently we could not condemn them; and therefore it happened that some carcases, which were those of perfectly healthy animals so far as cattle plague was concerned, were condemned in the market as unfit for food; but wherever it was possible, we have got the medical officer of the district to examine the carcases of the healthy animals, and when he has condemned them, we have immediately ordered them to be destroyed or buried.

186. Will you now describe the action of the inspectors after the Order of April the 16th came into force?—They proceeded to inquire as to the condition of animals in their several districts, and they reported every day to the travelling inspectors, and the travelling inspectors reported every day to me. When cattle plague was discovered, the usual course was, that the inspector remained there until the work was done, and in addition to that, Mr. Courtney generally took charge of the arrangements for slaughtering; he obtained closed conveyences, and a staff of slaughtermen, and continued the work without intermission, until the whole of the animals were disposed of.

187. With regard to the entry on the premises, had the inspectors power to enter all premises?—They had power to enter if they had reason to suspect the existence of cattle plague.

188. But I understood you to say that as soon as the April Order came into force the inspectors were instructed to make a general inspection of the dairies of the metropolis?—They were instructed to make a general inquiry, but they are distinctly told not to enter premises unless they have good reason to suspect disease, and never to enter without the consent of the owners.

189. Was there any difficulty thrown in their way?—In a few cases the owners of dairies objected to allow them even to look in at the doors.

190. To that extent, therefore, the powers are deficient if you wish to take the necessary precautions for ascertaining that the disease does not exist in a town?—To that extent, they are.

Of

Chairman—continued.

Of course the difficulty could be overcome by the inspector simply writing a certificate to the effect that he had reason to suspect disease. That would be a mere legal form which would give him power of entry.

191. He would not be justified in doing that unless he really suspected the existence of the disease?—Certainly not.

192. Almost immediately on the coming into operation of this Order, another case of cattle plague broke out, did it not?—The first case after the coming into operation of the Order was on the following day, April the 17th, when a cow and two calves were found to be affected with cattle plague in the Willesden district.

193. Was that at the same farm as the original outbreak?—Not at the same farm, but in the infected place, that is to say, within the mile radius.

194. Within the area of the circle that had been drawn round it?—Yes.

195. Were many animals affected by it at that time?—There were only a cow and two calves on the premises; they were seen by the chief inspector at one o'clock, and under Captain Tennant's direction they were all buried, and all the sweepings of the shed by seven o'clock the same evening, and all the manure on the premises was buried by eight o'clock the next morning, and the sheds were nailed up until the disinfecting process could be applied.

196. Have all the sheds in the east of London been visited by this time?—The sheds have been visited throughout the greater part of the metropolis.

197. Has any disease been detected during those visits?—None in the east of London, but there have been one or two cases in the north.

198. We have not done with the Willesden outbreak yet I think, for there was another on the 21st of April, was there not?—There was another on the 21st of April amongst 65 cows; in this case, the notice of the disease was not given until the animal was dead or dying; it was found dead when the inspector arrived, and five others were found to be diseased.

199. Did that notice come from the owner?—That notice came from the owner to the police late at night. On the following morning the cow was found dead.

200. And that happened before your inspector arrived?—Before he arrived; he found five others diseased on his arrival.

201. Were those animals slaughtered?—They were all slaughtered, healthy and diseased, as quickly as possible; I think in 24 hours, they were all disposed of.

202. Have you been able to trace in any way the origin of that outbreak?—No; the disease occurred in the infected place, and there is no room at all for doubt that persons who had been on the other premises, or in some way in contact with diseased animals, had also been in contact with these; but in all these instances it is difficult to get information, because the persons who are likely to have conveyed the disease would naturally be very indisposed to make any statement which would identify them with the outbreak.

203. But all that possibly occurred before the Privy Council took the charge of the district, before their rules with regard to disinfecting came in force?—Quite so.

204. That was an outbreak on the 21st of April; there was another on the 22nd, I think?—On the 22nd an outbreak occurred in the western part of the metropolis, in Ledbury Mews.

205. That was a considerable distance from where any of the previous outbreaks had taken place, was it not?—It was; but it was probably connected with the outbreak at Shepherd's Bush. The owners of the animals in Ledbury Mews had a dairy farm in the metropolis, in the Acton district; his lease expired, I think, on the 9th of April, and he consequently sold off all his stock; 14 of the animals were either not sold or were not taken away, and he consequently retained them in his possession; obtained a licence for a cab stable in Ledbury Mews, converted it into a cow shed, and put those 14 animals there. About a week after they were brought in one of the 14 animals was found to be ill. It was presumed to be affected with pleuro-pneumonia, but, from what we have since ascertained, there is little or no doubt that it was affected with cattle plague. It is a matter of certainty that it was not affected with pleuro-pneumonia, and the local inspector who examined it stated his impression at the time that it was affected with cattle plague.

206. Was that your own inspector?—No, an inspector of the local authority.

207. But this was subsequently to the time when the Department had taken the control, was it not?—This first cow was killed on the 17th of April, the day after the Department took charge of the cattle plague; and although the animals in the shed appeared to be healthy they were kept under observation. It was not until the Saturday that they gave any marked evidence of disease, and on the Sunday morning the whole 13 were found to be affected; but in each instance the disease was quite in the early stage.

208. And they were all destroyed, I think?—They were all destroyed; but I ascertained that the sale was held a fortnight previously, and in the neighbourhood of Shepherd's Bush. There is scarcely room for doubt, I think, that the same butcher who had been concerned with those diseased animals, of which I have previously spoken, and some of his men, at any rate persons from the Willesden district, where cattle plague had been raging up to that time, were attending at the sale. We have not succeeded in getting a list of the names, but it can hardly be questioned, when a thing of that kind took place, that all the persons in the neighbourhood who are concerned with stock, at any rate look in for the purpose of seeing what is going on; and there can be no question at all that the animals took the disease at the time of that sale. The outbreak that occurred some six days afterwards proves that to demonstration.

209. Those were cattle that had not been sold on the occasion when the owner removed to the other place?—They were.

210. Did you trace the cattle which had been sold on that occasion?—We ascertained the destination of some of them, but there has been no

Professor *Brown.*

11 May 1877.

Chairman—continued.

outbreak in any place where the remainder of the animals were taken, as far as we know.

211. The next outbreak was on the 23rd of April, the next day, was it not?—It was in the Kensal Green district, just on the confines of the boundaries of the Willesden infected place. On those premises there were 75 cows; two were attacked, and one of them died before it could be slaughtered.

212. Did you get the information in the same way, from the owners?—The information was given by the owner to the police.

213. Did you get that information in time, so that your inspector was there before the animal died?—The inspector, I believe, arrived before the animal died, but the animal died before arrangements could be made for slaughtering.

214. I suppose all the animals there were slaughtered too?—All of them were slaughtered.

215. The next day another outbreak occurred, I think?—Another outbreak occurred on a farm in the occupation of a brother of the man whose stock were first attacked in the Willesden district.

216. And that was on a farm where there were a very large number of cattle, was it not?—There were 124 cattle there. One was found to be diseased, and it was ascertained that some from the same herd had been sent to the Metropolitan Market on the day of the discovery of the outbreak.

217. No trace, I suppose, has been found of what happened to those beasts?—We ascertained that they were all sold to metropolitan butchers.

218. Were they sold for slaughter?—They were sold for slaughter.

219. There was a possibility in that way of disseminating the disease?—Undoubtedly.

220. I think the next outbreak in sequence took place at Stoke Newington?—The next outbreak occurred on the 1st of May at Stoke Newington, in the north of London. There were 49 cows in that shed.

221. Did you trace the commencement of the disease there to any contact with other places?—No, we have not found any clue at all to the origin of the outbreak there; it is known that several animals had been removed from the shed at Stoke Newington shortly before on account of pleuro-pneumonia, but we can only suspect that some of the butchers who were concerned in this removal had conveyed the infecting matter.

222. That again is evidence of the danger which appears in all these cases, viz., that the contact with people moving about in their different trades spreads the disease in a way that you cannot prevent?—That is so.

223. Then I think the 5th of May was the next time on which the disease showed itself?—On the 5th of May a report was received of an outbreak in Hull.

224. And that was after a lapse of some weeks since the last outbreak there?—A lapse of something like six weeks.

225. Were there many beasts attacked in that case?—There were five animals in the shed, and one was attacked.

226. Have you discovered any cause for that?—At present there is no cause whatever to connect this outbreak with the previous existence of the disease.

Chairman—continued.

227. Did you send an inspector from the department down there?—I immediately, on receiving information of the outbreak, telegraphed to Mr. Duguid, of the Brown Institution, whose services had been placed at our disposal by the Royal Agricultural Society, to ask him if he could go, and I telegraphed to the inspector at Hull to ask whether the animals were alive. I thought it probable that they would all have been slaughtered, and under such conditions, of course, no investigation of any value could have been made. I heard that the animals were still alive, and would be kept alive until an inspector arrived. Mr. Duguid went to Hull upon the same evening by the night train. He stated to me that the symptoms in the animal while it was alive were doubtful; but on post-mortem examination he obtained what, in his mind, was perfectly satisfactory evidence of the disease. I asked him particularly if he thought that the matter could be left as doubtful, but he said that, from the appearances which he discovered, he could not entertain any doubt whatever upon the subject.

228. Were you satisfied in your own mind, from the evidence that he gave you, that it was a case of cattle plague?—No, I must confess that I was not satisfied, for the reason that during the outbreak which lasted from 1865 to 1867, it was part of my duty to investigate the supposed outbreaks all over the kingdom, and also in the Isle of Man. I met with instances where the evidences of cattle plague were so decided that a conference of inspectors was held over the animal's carcase, and they unanimously concluded that the disease was cattle plague. I found that in Cheshire. The post-mortem appearances afforded a justification for this opinion, but I have met with so many cases where the morbid appearances of cattle plague were present, and where at the same time it was evident from the surrounding circumstances that the disease was not cattle plague, that I entirely lost my faith in evidence of this kind. In the case which I referred to in Cheshire, which is one of a number, I reported to the Government that the disease was not cattle plague. The five or six inspectors who were consulted reported that it was cattle plague. The local authority ultimately decided that they would wait the event. There were a large number of animals on the premises in the field where three had been attacked, and they decided to test the view by keeping the animals alive. I believe one or two others were attacked with the same affection, and it then ceased, and no more cases occurred.

229. That was in 1865, in the first outbreak of cattle plague?—It was during the first outbreak of cattle plague; I may say that in the Isle of Man, if I had drawn my conclusions from the post-mortem appearances, my opinion would probably have led to the destruction of a third of the stock in the island; I felt quite convinced from the first post-mortem examination that I had cattle plague to deal with, but I had previously got into the habit of dealing with the case as a whole; I was not in the position of the inspector of a local authority, who is bound to say at once whether it is cattle plague or not, and I therefore refrained from giving any opinion at all until I had sufficiently investigated the

Chairman—continued.

the particular case. Before I had been in the island a week, I satisfied myself that the disease could not be cattle plague.

230. Notwithstanding your first impression?—Notwithstanding my first impression.

231. Were you then on a tour of inspection for the department?—I was sent to the Isle of Man in consequence of a report which had been made by the local inspector, and which I think from the appearances he was quite justified in making, that cattle plague had got into the island. The Governor of the Island telegraphed to the English Government, requesting that an inspector should be sent over; and after the inquiry was completed, I reported that the disease was not cattle plague, but a non-contagious affection.

232. Notwithstanding your first belief in the disease, you satisfied yourself, by the test of time, that it was not a contagious disease at all?—Quite so; I found that in all parts of the island cases had occurred among herds varying in number from 10 to 30 or 40, and I ascertained that the disease had ceased after the occurrence of one or two cases; that fact in itself was quite sufficient to preclude the idea of the disease being contagious; and not being contagious, of course it could not be cattle plague.

233. Does not that throw some doubt upon the results of post-mortem examinations; because I understood you to say, that on the post-mortem examination that you first made, you satisfied yourself as to the fact of its being cattle plague?—I satisfied myself so far as it was possible to be satisfied from a post-mortem examination.

234. You would tell the Committee that in your opinion, a post-mortem examination is not an infallible guide as to the existence of the disease?—I have already stated that, and in the report which was written by Professor Simonds and myself in 1868, we both concluded from our independent investigations all over the kingdom, that it is in many cases not possible to decide from the symptoms during life, added to a post-mortem examination, whether an animal is affected with cattle plague or not.

235. And it is from the experience which you gained in 1865, that you have doubt in your own mind with regard to the outbreak of the 5th of May at Hull, having been really an outbreak of cattle plague, notwithstanding the report of the inspector?—I have, for the reason that the evidence derived from a post-mortem examination does not satisfy my mind. I have no doubt at all that the evidence of the existence of the disease was very strong, because Mr. Duguid has had large experience; he was engaged during the prevalence of the disease in 1865, 1866, and 1877, in conducting various experiments while the Royal Commission was sitting; and he has been concerned largely in post-mortem examinations and in the examination of animals affected with disease; but all I can say is that the evidence which satisfies him and others who believe that the evidence of a post-mortem examination is sufficient does not satisfy me, in consequence of the circumstance to which I have referred, viz., that in so many instances I have found all the evidence which he found, and the after circumstances have proved that the disease was not cattle plague.

236. And in this case, the cattle plague having

Chairman—continued.

disappeared for so many weeks there, and no fresh cause having been given for its re-introduction by importation, the probability in your view is, that the symptoms were misrepresented?—I think it at any rate probable.

237. This herd at Hull only consisted of five beasts, I think?—Five cows.

238. What was done with the others?—They were all slaughtered immediately that Mr. Duguid decided that it was cattle plague.

239. They were all slaughtered, and treated as infected cattle?—At once. In such a case, in order to justify the statement which I have just made as to the doubt in my mind, I should like to suggest to the Committee the course which I should myself have adopted. I first of all start with a knowledge of the fact that there has been no cattle plague known to exist there for six weeks, and that all the sheds where it has existed have been cleansed and disinfected, and the premises declared free. I should have gone into the inquiry with the firm conviction that it could not be cattle plague, and I should only have yielded that conviction upon the most overwhelming evidence. In the first place, I should not have gone near the shed at all until I had made inquiries over the whole of the dairies in Hull; I should have found out whether any persons had got rid of their stock. That inquiry is now being carried on, and we shall hear more shortly. Finding that everything there was intact, and that there was no reason to suspect that any disease had continued there, I should then have examined the healthy animals in the shed before I had gone near the diseased ones. In certainly 99 instances out of every 100 I should have found one or two of those remaining animals with a temperature indicating the existence of fever, a temperature of 105°, or above.

240. Showing signs that they were equally affected?—Quite so.

241. I infer from your present statement that this was not the course pursued by Mr. Duguid?—No; he decided from the single case, and the local authority acted upon his statement, which of coarse they were bound to do, and which undoubtedly was the most cautious mode of proceeding. Having ascertained the state of the healthy animals, I should then have examined the diseased one, and even if I had found the symptoms indicative of cattle plague more pronounced than they were, I should not then have admitted the idea into my mind that it was cattle plague. I should have had that animal destroyed, and have made a post-mortem examination, and got what farther evidence I could from that. I should then have shut up the remaining animals, taken the key of the door in my pocket, and I should have remained there, or made repeated visits, or placed some one to take charge of them, until every one of them had had the disease. I should have done that in this case, because the principle involved is most serious. If it is possible for an outbreak of cattle plague to occur six weeks after a place is declared free without any palpable evidence of communication being obtainable, the question naturally arises, when are we to consider ourselves free?

242. But there was a considerable interval, was there not, between any outbreaks in several of the cases to which you have already referred.

Professor *Brown.*

11 May 1877.

Chairman—continued.

In the Lincolnshire case there was a considerable interval, was there not?—There was; and that is one of the cases which I should have dealt with in the same way.

243. You had in your own mind doubts also as to this outbreak being really cattle plague?—I had doubts on that ground.

244. Can you state what interval there was between that outbreak and the one which preceded it?—The outbreak occurred in Lincolnshire on March the 8th.

245. I forgot to ask you whether any attempt was made to trace that outbreak in Lincolnshire?—An inquiry was made with that view, but no evidence whatever was obtained.

246. There was no evidence of contact in any way with the previous outbreak of disease?—None whatever; but in that case several animals were found to be affected.

247. And there was no trace of animals having been brought recently into that farm?—No; it is quite certain that no introduction of fresh stock had taken place for some months.

248. And that led you to form, with regard to that outbreak, a similar opinion to that which you have expressed to the Committee with regard to the outbreak at Hull?—It did.

249. With regard to the Lincolnshire outbreak, was the decision that it was cattle plague come to by the local inspector or by the Government Department Inspector?—The local authority inspector, who had considerable experience in the last outbreak, decided at once that the animals were affected with cattle plague.

250. Was his opinion strengthened in his own judgment by the post-mortem examination?—I believe there was no post-mortem examination made; but the chief inspector from the Veterinary Department was sent down at once. He saw the animals which were diseased; three or four animals, I think, when he arrived were diseased; and he was perfectly convinced also from the symptoms that it was undoubtedly cattle plague.

251. Was any post-mortem examination made in the case of any of the animals?—I believe, in fact I am quite certain, that there was none. In this case there was, of course, a possibility, and even a probability, of the infection being conveyed from Hull, because the disease had been prevailing there since February the 15th, and had continued up to March the 22nd.

252. And it broke out in Lincolnshire on March the 8th?—Yes.

253. I understood you to say that those who have inquired into it have not been able to trace any cause for this outbreak, either by the introduction of fresh animals or by their knowledge of people having been in contact with the Hull infected district?—None whatever.

254. Inquiry was made with a view of ascertaining it?—Yes, very close inquiry. If it could have been shown that the persons had come from the dairy in William-street, where the disease broke out on the 27th, or that any persons from the farm had visited that dairy, or had even gone to Hull at that time, there would have been a connecting link; but it was stated that the men on the premises had not been to Hull for a considerable time, and that the greatest care had been taken to prevent persons from coming on to those premises; and there is the further fact,

Chairman—continued.

that although three animals were attacked before the disease was identified, no extension of the infection took place.

255. This Hull outbreak brings us down to May the 5th; the last outbreak in the metropolis is considerably further back; has any subsequent sign of the continuance of the disease been shown in the metropolis, to your knowledge?—Up to this morning the report is, that all the dairies as to which inquiries have been made are perfectly free.

256. There has been no symptom, to your knowledge, of any continuance of the disease since the 1st May at Stoke Newington?—No, that is the last case.

257. There has not been sufficient lapse of time, therefore, to enable you to consider the metropolis safe from a fresh outbreak?—No, we can hardly consider the metropolis safe for something like a month, because it is possible that individuals may have carried some infecting matter away with them, and it is possible that its vitality may have remained during that time, but it is not very probable.

258. Is there also a possibility that in some of those sheds where you were not able to make an inspection, from the refusal of the proprietors to admit you, the disease may be being perpetuated?—It is quite possible that animals may have been attacked and removed to the butchers on the plea of pleuro-pneumonia, and in that way the disease would escape our notice for a time. I should like to say, in reference to the evidence of cattle plague, that I am not dealing more hardly with the inspectors who have been concerned in those cases which I have termed doubtful than I am dealing with myself; because I look back to several instances where I am firmly convinced that I have slaughtered a lot of animals unnecessarily, where I have decided upon evidence that I should not decide upon now.

259. What you represent is, that in cases of this sort you would now wait until you have cleared up all this outside evidence before you really attacked the disease itself; whereas they go into it with the belief that, as disease exists, it probably is cattle plague, and they look at it from that point of view first?—That is what I mean, and I acted upon that principle not many days ago in the metropolis. A case was reported where the symptoms of cattle plague were so far developed that it was said that there was no doubt at all about it.

260. Where did it take place?—In the north of London. Perhaps I had better not mention the name of the individual.

261. Was it subsequently to the Stoke Newington outbreak?—Yes, but in that instance there was no possible way of accounting for the disease. Some of the symptoms described to me were not those of cattle plague, and my instructions were to keep the place under supervision, and leave the animal alone. It died, and a post-mortem examination resulted in the detection of certain lesions which were strongly suggestive of cattle plague. I still said: "Let the animals alone;" there were a large number in the shed, between 60 and 70; and the result has been that up to this morning all those animals are perfectly healthy.

262. Have precautions been taken, with regard to that shed, to prevent the contact with other

cattle

Chairman—continued.

cattle by the movement of people?—Yes, every precaution that was considered necessary, supposing the disease to have been cattle plague, has been taken.

263. Whilst waiting to decide as to the disease, you have treated the shed and the ground as if it were an infected place?—We have, and I may add that Professor Simonds was kind enough to attend the post-mortem examination of this animal, and he informed me that there were circumstances which led him to suspect that it might be cattle plague. At any rate the case was sufficiently serious to justify the premises being dealt with as though it were, until it is proved that it is not.

264. I understand you to say that the symptoms which were described to you, and also seen by you in the post-mortem examination, indicated cattle plague?—They were of such a kind as would justify an inspector generally in deciding that the disease was cattle plague.

265. In suspecting it?—I would go further than that, and I would say, even in deciding, if he derived his opinion from the appearances which he discovered in the animal, quite irrespective of any other considerations.

266. How many days have elapsed since the death of that animal during which the rest of the herd have remained sound?—Some 11 days, so that what was presumed to be the case, is a matter of fact, viz., that the animal was not the subject of cattle plague.

267. In fact, if from four to seven days is taken as the time of incubation generally, I suppose you are fairly satisfied by the lapse of time that your first impressions were erroneous?—It was not my impression, because I did not see the animal; but I am satisfied that the first impression was an erroneous one, and that the animals, so far as that case is concerned, are free from the slightest risk of infection.

268. That strengthens your opinion that, as you have stated, it is quite possible that in some of those other instances similar results might have followed upon the same course of action?—Quite so. But of course when it is known that cattle plague is existing in a district, anything like excess of caution is not advisable. I should always instruct the inspectors to act on suspicion from fear that they might, from being too cautious, make a mistake in the wrong direction. I should always forgive a man for killing animals unnecessarily, but I should never forgive him if he allowed diseased ones to escape.

269. Have you had any information in the department or otherwise as to the continuance of disease on the Continent in those places from which these animals come?—We have had regular information from Germany since the telegram on the 9th January. On that date the disease existed in two villages in Upper Silesia in the Oppeln district.

270. That is the same district from which the first affected animals came?—It is. Then on the 15th January we received the intelligence of the existence of cattle plague in the Altona market, which is in the Holstein district, bordering on the Hamburg frontier.

271. Are you aware whether that was traced to the same source in Silesia?—I am informed that the man who had the disease in his sheds bought animals in Berlin which were known to have come from the Silesian district.

Chairman—continued.

272. Were those the cattle that you described as standing in the market at Berlin at the same time that infected cattle were being sent here?—They were bought by this man and taken into his sheds.

273. Is that all the information that you can give us with regard to what has taken place since on the Continent?—No, I have here the whole information of the progress of the disease through Germany.

274. Will you state what has been the progress of the disease from the time when it first broke out?—On the 16th January, cattle plague was detected in the market at Breslau, supposed to have been brought there by a dealer who purchased animals in Silesia. On the 22nd January we had further information from Hamburg, that the disease was said to be still spreading, and in one case it was detected on an island in the Elbe, and cases were also actually detected in the cattle market, where 13 cattle were slaughtered, and all the stalls and fences about the market were burnt down. The total number of cattle slaughtered since January in Hamburg was 300, at a cost to the Imperial Treasury of more than 15,000 *l*. On the 18th January, cattle plague was detected in Berlin in the cattle yard. On the 20th it was detected among 32 oxen near Breslau; on the 22nd, among nine oxen near Leuthen; on the 23rd, among three oxen again near Breslau; on the 25th it was detected in Holstein in a herd of 11 cattle; again on the 26th, it was detected in the same district among 28 cattle; and on the 27th in the same district among 13 cattle. On the same day a further case occurred in the Oppeln district among two cattle; on the 30th January the disease again appeared near Breslau among 47 cattle; it was detected in Dresden on the 5th February, and also in Hamburg, and at Cologne, where it was introduced by a herd brought from Dresden.

275. Then it is spread generally throughout the district?—It is extended over the greater part of the district from the eastern to the western frontier. On the 7th February it was reported from Potsdam, and from the town of Emden, which is very close to the Netherlands frontier. Its appearance in that town led to the passing of an Order in this country, putting cattle, sheep, and goats from the Netherlands in the schedule. Although, at the time, Holland had strictly prohibited the importation of all animals from Germany, and indeed from any other country, it was thought that the proximity of the disease made the risk of its introduction so great, that it would not be safe to allow those animals to go free. On 8th February, the disease was reported at Arnsberg. On the 8th and 10th, 27 cattle and five sheep were attacked at Emden.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*.

276. That is uncommon, is it not?—I think there were something like 100 sheep attacked in Germany, altogether.

Chairman.

277. We have never had an introduction of cattle plague that could be traced to imported sheep, have we?—

Professor *Brown.*

11 May 1877.

Chairman—continued.

we?—No; we have had the disease in sheep in this country extensively in something like 20 counties, I think, during the former outbreak, but we have never had it introduced by sheep. The cattle plague appeared again at Dresden on the 10th February and on the 14th February; again in Herzberg, with cattle brought from Dresden, on the 13th February; it appeared at Cologne again on the 15th; at Emden again on the 15th and 18th; near Breslau again on the 17th and 19th, in two herds consisting of 13 and 35 head of cattle respectively. On the 15th it was detected in Saxony, at Seidan, in one cow which was brought from a slaughter-house in Dresden; and on the same day it appeared near Leipzig, in two farmyards, in 15 head of cattle. At Dusseldorf, on the 21st and 23rd of February, two cases occurred in a herd of 90 cattle. In Seltow and Potsdam, it was detected on the 22nd. Further outbreaks occurred in Saxony on the 23rd, the 25th, and the 27th. Again it appeared at Emden, on 4th March, in a herd of 15 cattle, and in this outbreak eight sheep were also found to be affected. Since the disease entered Germany, outbreaks occurred in about 50 different places; the number of horned cattle infected and killed amounted to about 1,000, and there were in addition several hundreds of sheep killed either in consequence of having the disease themselves, or in consequence of having been herded with those which were affected. Further outbreaks occurred in the kingdom of Saxony, on the 11th and 12th March. The case on the 12th March was the last, and the German Empire was declared free from cattle plague on the 10th of April.

278. So that it has practically ceased in Germany?—It practically ceased in Germany on the 12th of March.

279. Then it took from the beginning of January to the 12th of March before they were able to stamp it out in Germany?—It did.

280. Are you satisfied from the time that has elapsed that in all probability it is stamped out in Germany, as stated?—Considering the severe regulations which they adopt, and their very careful system of inquiry, I think there can be no doubt about it.

281. They have carried out a very severe system since the disease was introduced in Germany, have they not?—Certainly, far more severe than anything that would be tolerated in this country.

282. Have they closed their country for importation?—Yes; they stopped not only importation, but also exportation.

283. They stopped all movement throughout the country?—Entirely; and they also adopt the system of declaring a place infected for 20 kilometres round the seat of the disease.

284. They draw a cordon round each outbreak?—Yes, for that distance, and in that district trade in cattle and transport of dung, fodder, straw, and other litter materials are only allowed by special permit.

285. What regulations do they lay down with regard to the moving of people out of those infected circles?—They insist that the farmyard in which the disease has appeared shall be entirely separated and watched by watchmen, who must not enter the place or communicate with the inhabitants, and must not allow the ingress or

Chairman—continued.

egress of persons except those legally authorised, nor of animals living or dead. Authority to enter infected farms is only given to persons engaged in extirpating the disease, and to clergymen, law officers, doctors and midwives, in the exercise of their profession.

286. Are those people required to disinfect themselves?—It is insisted that they must be properly disinfected before they are allowed to leave; I may state that complaints have been made about the permission which is given to clergymen; it is said that clergymen, of all people, are those who are most consulted by the poor, and that if any man has a cow sick he is quite sure to ask the clergyman's advice about it; so that in that way it is quite probable that the disease can be extended.

287. The clergyman is, therefore, the readiest means of contagion?—Yes; but we have the stern fact that they always do deal with cattle plague effectually, however it may spread, and get rid of it in a short time.

288. And those are regulations which before the last Committee we had evidence had been for many years in force in Prussia, before Germany became united?—Quite so.

289. At present these regulations extend to the whole of Germany, and Schlezwig-Holstein too, of course, as part of Germany?—Wherever the cattle plague appears in Holstein the same regulations are applied, but it seldom gets many miles through the country. I believe on the last occasion it extended to a distance of something like nine miles only before it was effectually arrested.

290. Notwithstanding these stringent regulations it has taken three months, as you have described, to stamp the disease out?—It has.

291. I suppose all these diseases have reached us from the Continent in their turn, have they?—One would conclude that that is the case, from the fact that they all had a prior existence on the Continent, although foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia were both introduced into this kingdom during the time that the importation of foreign animals was entirely prohibited.

292. You mean by that, that before 1842 they prevailed to a considerable extent?—Foot-and-mouth disease was certainly present in this kingdom in 1839, and pleuro-pneumonia in the latter part of 1840, and before 1842 they had both of them attained a very considerable degree of prevalence in this country.

293. Sheep-pox was not introduced, I think, until after the free import of cattle had taken place in 1846?—Not until 1847; that is to say, speaking in reference to our own times, because there are historical accounts of all these diseases; at any rate of cattle plague and sheep-pox, having been introduced in former centuries.

294. But taking the last 100 years it did not appear until that date?—Taking the last 100 years sheep-pox was not introduced until 1847.

295. How was it stopped then?—It prevailed for some considerable period, and it was not, I believe, finally extirpated until about 1852.

296. What steps were taken for arresting it; was there any compulsory slaughter at that time?—There was no compulsory slaughter; slaughter was adopted in many cases where animals were *in extremis*, but generally the disease was treated and

Chairman—continued.

and inoculation was practised to a very considerable extent.

297. Then it returned again in 1862, did it not, after having been stopped in 1852 by these methods?—It did, and also in 1865 and 1866.

298. That was after the cattle plague had come into the country in 1865?—It was. The last two outbreaks were during the time that the cattle plague existed.

299. Since 1866, have we had any introduction of it into the country?—We have had the disease introduced from abroad, but it has not extended beyond the landing-places.

300. You have been able to stop it by slaughter at the port of landing?—We have.

301. With regard to cattle plague, in your opinion, has the slaughter which was adopted under that Act, at the place of landing, protected us sufficiently from the possibility of the introduction of that disease?—It is quite evident that it has not. In fact the prevention and interdiction of the landing has not protected us, when animals affected with cattle plague have been brought close to our coast.

302. In consequence of the facility that there is for mediate contagion?—Quite so.

303. With regard to these precautions, as affecting pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and mouth diseases, what has been the result?—I believe that in reference to foot-and-mouth disease the present restrictions prevent the introduction of the infective matter to any serious extent. I have no doubt that a certain number of outbreaks are traceable to the introduction of infected foreign animals, but I do not believe that the prevalence of the disease in this country has anything whatever to do, speaking generally, with its introduction from abroad.

304. You believe that it is naturalised in the country to a certain extent?—I believe it is so far naturalised, that as long as we supply new material the disease will go on.

305. And you think that no stoppage of importation would affect, to any great extent, the present prevalence of these two diseases?—I think that that point is as nearly as possible proved by the example afforded us in other countries.

306. Do you refer to the colonies?—In the colonies, and in Australia particularly, the disease was introduced something like 20 years ago; they do not import, or, at any rate, not to any extent. Australia is not an importing country, but since the time of its introduction the disease has continued to prevail there. The same observation applies, though not perhaps to the same extent, to Ireland, where comparatively few animals are introduced, and where, notwithstanding, the disease, since it was introduced in 1840, has continued to prevail. The Netherlands affords another illustration. The Netherlands Government has for some five or six years prohibited the importation of stock from other countries; they have made the most strenuous efforts to eradicate the disease; they insist upon the slaughter of diseased animals, and the inoculation of the rest of the herd; but, notwithstanding those precautions, pleuro-pneumonia still exists in the Netherlands, although its spreading has been considerably controlled. I look upon the idea of the disease (either pleuro-pneumonia or foot-and-mouth disease) dying out as a pure myth. The suggestion that if you stop the supply from abroad the affections will die out is, to my

Chairman—continued.

mind, entirely incomprehensible. I do not see on what plea it can be said that a disease will die out, when you perpetually supply it with new material in your own country.

307. And you instance the case of Holland as one proof of it?—Holland, and Ireland, and the colonies, particularly Australia.

308. Holland and Australia are the two principal places, because in Australia importation is stopped altogether, as it is in Holland?—Yes.

309. What measures would you suggest to prevent the introduction of this disease?—I should make certain alterations in the present system of dealing with these diseases, or I should make a radical change, abandoning the present system altogether, and adopting an entirely new one in its place.

310. What would that be?—First of all, having regard to the existence of these two diseases in this country, I should feel bound to impose very severe restrictions upon the cattle trade. Both in reference to foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia, there can, I think, be no question whatever that the infective matter is chiefly conveyed through the movement of diseased and infected animals. Therefore I should be obliged to adopt such a system as would entirely prevent this movement. In order to do that, I should be compelled to divide the whole country into districts, placing each one in charge of an inspector, who would be in constant communication with the central department. Having found all the centres where either disease exists in the district, it would be absolutely essential to prevent the movement of animals from those centres during the continuance of the disease.

311. That is, dealing with it here?—Dealing with it here. Then having arranged that no animals should be removed from a place where disease prevails, and to that extent preventing its dissemination, I should adopt certain arrangements with a view to preventing its reintroduction from foreign countries. First, I should schedule all countries where pleuro-pneumonia exists. I should refuse to allow any countries to be taken out of the schedule, unless they could prove that they were free from disease at the time; and further, that they had such regulations in their country as would in all probability prevent the introduction of disease from other countries.

312. You would require that they should be, as Holland is, a non-importing country?—In the first place; and in the second place, that they were free from disease. But I should only adopt that system upon the clear understanding that an equally severe repressive system should be adopted in this country. It does not appear to be consistent to impose severe restrictions upon foreign animals which are brought here, and at the same time to allow the diseases which we propose to arrest to be carried freely over this country through the movement of diseased and infected animals.

313. What you represent, I suppose, is that if the object is absolutely to stamp it out, it would not avail to stamp it out with regard to the foreign importation alone, but that the same restrictions must apply generally?—That is my impression.

314. In dealing with the foreign imports, what restrictions would you place upon the conveyance of cattle from those countries, where allowed?

—First,

Professor *Brown.*

11 May 1877.

Chairman—continued.

—First, with regard solely to cattle plague, I think there is no escape from the conclusion, that as slaughter at the port of landing has failed to protect us, we must either adopt a new system of dealing with animals on arrival here, or we must totally prohibit the introduction of live animals, at any rate of live cattle, from countries where cattle plague exists, or where it is likely to be introduced. If we adopted the first system, it would be necessary to have cattle brought in ships which were exclusively devoted to that trade, and which could be detained at the place of landing until the condition of the animals had been certified by the inspector; and it would also be necessary that the persons who had come over with those cattle should be treated as the cattle are themselves, and be detained for the 12 hours, or whatever other time might be thought necessary.

315. That there should be no possibility of any communication as from those vessels with the shore?—Quite so. I believe this system would be so onerous that it would be impracticable. I do not apprehend that we should be able either to detain the ship or the animals. I do not for a moment imagine that the persons forming the crew of the vessel would submit to any such restriction. Therefore I am forced to the conviction that the only way of dealing with cattle plague is to prohibit the importation of live cattle from those countries where cattle plague has been certified to exist.

316. Or countries from which, or through which, the transit of animals is likely?—Quite so.

317. What countries would that embrace?—Germany and Belgium; the cattle from Schleswig and Holstein I think might, without risk, be allowed to come to this country for the purpose of slaughter.

318. You are of course dealing now only with the case of cattle plague?—Entirely. Immediately on learning that the cattle plague had entered Germany, even at the extreme eastern frontier, I should totally prohibit meat, hides, hoofs, and horns, and, in fact, all animal products which might be likely to convey the disease.

319. I understood you to say that, whilst prohibiting the importation of cattle from the country in a live state, if cattle plague broke out in such scheduled countries, you would then go further, and prohibit the import of those other articles, including meat?—During the time that cattle plague existed in that country I should.

320. You would include meat?—Meat, hides, horns, and hoofs, chiefly.

321. What would be the object of including the dead meat?—Chiefly from the apprehension that meat from cattle-plague animals would be sent over.

322. You think that, in fact, as soon as cattle plague broke out in a country, the object would be to kill the animals and send them over to market in this country?—Yes; and, knowing that the German Government would get rid of the disease in a very short time, I should not apprehend any very great inconvenience from the prohibition of the importation of meat during the time that the disease existed there.

323. This ought to apply, in your opinion, only to what you have described as the "scheduled" countries?—The total prohibition I should only apply to cattle from Germany and Belgium.

324. You would deal with them in the same way as the department at present deals with Russia?—Or rather, as at present we are dealing with them.

325. What I mean by my question is, that for some time the import of cattle from Russia has been entirely prohibited; therefore you would place Germany, the Netherlands, and Belgium in the same position as Russia?—I should, except that I should allow the importation of all the products of the animals.

326. Those are stopped with regard to Russia?—Yes, or they are admitted only under restrictions; I should not interfere with those trades at all, so long as the country remained free from disease.

327. And only on the breaking out of disease would you enforce the orders as regards those other articles?—Yes.

328. How would you deal with such countries as France and Schleswig-Holstein under a system such as you have suggested?—I should leave France in the schedule, and I should also keep Schleswig and Holstein in the schedule.

329. When you say that you would keep them in the schedule, do you mean that you would prohibit those countries sending live-stock here; or would you allow them to send live-stock, provided they were slaughtered at the port of debarkation?—I should allow them to send live-stock here, provided it were slaughtered at the port of debarkation.

330. As to the other countries, Spain, and Portugal, and Norway, and Sweden, and Denmark, would you place them as unscheduled and unrestricted, or would you deal with them as you propose to deal with Schleswig-Holstein and France?—I should allow them to send animals here as unscheduled animals, but on the condition that they gave satisfactory proof that their country was free from disease, and that they had made such arrangements as in all probability would keep their country free. I am speaking now solely in reference to cattle plague. I should not interfere with those countries at all on the question of cattle plague; I should let them send their animals here quite free.

331. This prohibition on the importation of live-stock would, in your opinion, give the greatest security, as I understand you, from the Continental diseases?—I believe that the total prohibition of the importation of live animals from Germany and Belgium would secure us from outbreaks of cattle plague.

332. But you would still be left exposed to the other diseases?—We should.

333. How would you deal with Holland; would you treat that as you would treat Denmark?—Yes, so far as cattle plague is concerned.

334. Because they have the same restrictions there with regard to importation?—They have.

335. Looking at the question from the other point of view: supposing those countries to be allowed to import free, what restrictions would you apply with regard to pleuro-pneumonia, which in Holland is acknowledged to be constantly existing?—There can be no question, I think, that in order to protect ourselves from pleuro-pneumonia we must schedule cattle from Holland.

336. That is to say, that Holland must on account of pleuro-pneumonia, and not on account of cattle plague, be placed in the schedule, and that, therefore, the cattle coming from that country

Chairman—continued.

try would be slaughtered at the port of debarkation?—They would. In the case of dairy-stock from Holland, if it is considered necessary to continue that importation, I should propose to insist upon animals being selected for the purpose of export to England, and I should only allow them to be shipped with a certificate of their origin, which should give certain guarantees that they had not come from a district where pleuro-pneumonia existed. On their arrival in this country they should be branded, sold only at a market which is not a market for fat stock, and kept under observation on the premises of the purchaser for at least three months.

337. And in that way you think that you might safely introduce for dairy purposes cows from Holland?—I think so; at any rate we should obtain the earliest information of an outbreak of pleuro-pneumonia, and we should be able to deal with it. But I may say that I make this proposition, having in my mind at the same time the scheme which I should propose for dealing with animals in this country, so that the two things will have to be read together.

338. On the ground, as you stated before, that you think that if steps are taken for eradicating pleuro-pneumonia by violent restrictions as against the importing trade, you should carry them out equally with regard to your home trade?—Quite so. If the object is to eradicate those diseases, and not merely to prohibit importation from abroad, then I contend that, in addition to severe restrictions upon foreign imports, we must adopt severe measures in our own country. In any case I should propose to prevent the future introduction of cattle plague, whether restrictions are applied in this country or not; but I should stop there, unless it is clearly understood that repressive measures are to be employed here for the purpose of eradicating pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease.

339. Do you believe that such restrictive measures as you think would be absolutely necessary would be tolerated in this country?—My impression is that they would not.

340. Then that breaks down at once the restrictive suggestions with regard to the dealing with foreign pleuro-pneumonia?—Quite so; it seems to me a useless proceeding to hamper the foreign trade and certainly to diminish the supply of animals to this country with the ostensible object of getting rid of certain diseases, unless you prove the honesty of your intentions by setting to work to get rid of those diseases at the same time; and I think that it is generally admitted that the only way to get rid of pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease in this country is to adopt restrictions of the most severe character; it is quite a matter of certainty that so long as we permit free trade and free movement of animals all over the kingdom, so long we must continue to have outbreaks of these affections.

341. And, therefore, really the scheme which you have suggested is limited to dealing with cattle plague, from your belief that those restrictions which you think are absolutely necessary for the whole country, if adopted at all for any part of the trade, would not be tolerated either here or in Ireland?—That is my impression from what I have seen and heard all over the kingdom. But it is fair to state that the allegations are to the contrary; I believe it is publicly asserted that if proper restrictions were

Chairman—continued.

put upon foreign importation the stockowners of this country are prepared to submit to any restrictions, however severe, for the purpose of getting rid of these diseases.

342. That is restricting movement and enforcing such regulations as you have suggested are in force on the Continent for the purpose?—Quite so. The statement which is made in public amounts to the mere general one that restrictions will be cheerfully submitted to. The difficulty to my mind will arise when it is known exactly what those restrictions will amount to. I can quite understand the stockowners of the country professing their readiness to do everything that is necessary so long as they have not the slightest conception of what the "necessary" is; but I very much fear that as soon as they know what is suggested, with one voice they would say, "This is a thing we cannot submit to."

343. And that makes you think that your recommendation should really be limited to dealing with the cattle plague, and not with pleuro-pneumonia?—That is quite my view of the matter.

344. I suppose you would base your ideas of dealing with the cattle plague in the way you have described upon the great danger that has been shown of its introduction into this country, in consequence of the difficulty of ascertaining what takes place with regard to it in the foreign district in which it is bred?—Quite so, and I think we have good ground for believing that the risk will increase every year. The facilities of transit are constantly increasing, and when it is known that animals may be moved from an infected district, and taken from one end of the German Empire to the other, before the disease is discovered, I think we have clear reason to apprehend that no international regulation can possibly protect us, and that nothing short of total prohibition of the importation of live cattle from those districts will be of the slightest use.

345. Evidence was given before the former Committee that the supplies were being drawn further from the south of Europe; I suppose that since that date we have even less reliable knowledge of the sources of our supply than we had then?—I certainly believe so.

346. I suppose your reason for allowing hides, hoofs, horns, bones, and other articles, to come in from what you have described as future scheduled countries, or prohibited countries, is, that it would most essentially interfere with a great many important industries if they were prohibited?—There is no doubt of it. We have been informed that even the temporary prohibition has led to a great deal of difficulty, and it seems that we have interfered very much with a large trade from South Africa. It appears that it is the custom to bring horns, and other animal products, from those countries, and land them in Hamburg or Belgium, and then by other vessels to bring them to this country, and we are informed that the system cannot be modified, and that they cannot be brought from the point of origin direct to this country, and that our prohibition amounts to a total stoppage of that trade.

347. And you believe that that relaxation with regard to those industries will not, to any material extent, prejudice the safety that you expect to derive from your prohibition of the

Professor *Brown.*

11 May 1877.

Chairman—continued.

importation of cattle?—No, I apprehend not to any appreciable extent.

348. Has your attention been at all called to what has been very much mentioned lately, and that is the American dead meat trade, which is supposed to have been created?—I have had my attention called to it merely as one of the public. I have not made any investigation in reference to the amount of the supply, or to the probability of its continuance.

349. Have you considered it, looking at it from a scientific point of view?—From a scientific point of view, I have no doubt that the importation of meat is quite feasible.

350. Do you include in the importation of meat the importation of offal as well?—Yes, I have no doubt that the present resources of science are equal to the preservation of meat and perishable articles of all kinds for practically an indefinite period. It is simply a question of cost. I have no doubt that that meat and offal can be brought from any part to this country in perfectly good condition.

351. Do you mean in all seasons of the year, in summer as well as in winter?—I have no doubt whatever that they can be so brought in all seasons of the year.

352. Supposing that they are brought, do you believe scientifically that they will arrive here in hot weather in such a condition as to be as available as meat in the market as if they were slaughtered here in the morning of the day?—I believe the difficulty will arise when the products arrive in this country in the very hottest weather, because I could not possibly conceive that meat brought here under any system whatever could be in better condition than meat which is killed at the moment of the arrival of the vessel. The difficulty which suggests itself to me is this: In both cases the meat which is killed at a given moment and prepared for sale, and the meat which arrives here from abroad will probably not keep more than 12 hours in very hot weather. Butchers are constantly compelled to kill their beef and mutton in the cool of the night, in order to supply their customers on the following day; and if they are induced to keep a leg of mutton for two days, I happen to know, as a matter of fact, that that mutton is commonly uneatable. Assuming that the meat which arrives here is just as good as the meat which is killed at the same moment under the most favourable circumstances, it appears to me that it would be almost impossible to distribute it to any extent without very materially interfering with its condition.

353. You mean that the difficulty of its transit through the country would make it impossible that you should get it fresh?—Unless it can be moved in the same apparatus in which it was brought to a landing-place.

354. I suppose a system might be set up which would enable you to carry the dead meat through in the same temperature to the market where it was to be sold, whether that was at the port of landing or in the centre of the country?—Undoubtedly. Then on arriving at the centre where it is to be consumed, you have still the difficulty of distribution, because you must consign to that town a certain quantity, and unless previous arrangements have been made for its immediate distribution, it must be bought by retail butchers, and must be conveyed by them in some way to their shops, and must be kept there until it is

Chairman—continued.

sold, and subsequently sent out to the customers.

355. That system is at present in existence in New York, I believe, and in this town itself a dead meat market exists?—Yes, but I am not aware if it has ever been tested in the very hottest weather.

356. Do you mean that the Smithfield Market has not been successful in the hot summer weather?—I thought you meant with reference to the imported meat.

357. I was referring to the possibility of a central depôt, such as the Smithfield Market, being created, into which the American meat could come, and where the retail trade could avail themselves of it?—I am not quite certain upon this point, but I believe that the supply in the very hottest weather is considerably diminished, on account of the difficulty of conveying the meat to distances in such a state that it will be fit for food when it arrives.

358. In very hot weather the mere carrying of it from the market to the shop from which it has to be sent out to the customers is prejudicial? Undoubtedly so, and we have this fact before us, that tons of meat are condemned in the hot weather as unfit for food.

359. I suppose that there is this to be said on the side of the imported dead meat trade, that in hot weather the animal is prepared for slaughter in a better way than he probably is after being driven as is the case in this country for some hours before he is killed?—I think it would amount to very much the same thing, because if there were on the other side of the water a slaughtering depôt, a larger number of animals would be driven up there just in time to be slaughtered as they are here.

360. You imagine that the same results would arise?—Yes, I should think as nearly as possible. It is always a point with the butchers in this country to keep the animals 12 or 24 hours before they kill them, knowing that under such conditions the meat will keep longer.

361. You have stated that from a scientific point of view you believe that the meat can be brought to this country; supposing it to be possible, have you considered the question of how the additional cost of the preparation of this meat affects the matter?—As far as I can see, the cost of the preparation of the meat on the other side of the water, of the proper refrigerating apparatus, and of all the conditions which are necessary to ensure safe transit, must be considerable.

362. Of course you are not now speaking of the American trade, but of the possibility of a dead meat trade from the scheduled countries whence you propose to stop the importation of live animals?—Chiefly in reference to European countries.

363. There the price of the animal ranges higher than it does in America, does it not?—Undoubtedly; it approaches somewhere near the wholesale price of meat in this country. In the American towns, I gather from a return which has just been printed, that the average price will not be very much above half the average price in this country.

364. It is about 4½*d.* as an average in New York?—That would be less than the half of the average wholesale price in this country; and that, of course, allows a very large margin for the cost

Chairman—continued.

cost of preparation, because I believe it is asserted that the meat from America must be sold at something like an average of 7½*d.* to 8*d.* per pound, otherwise the trade will not pay.

365. What you represent then is, that with the prices at present ranging on the Continent, that condition of things which exists in America could not take place?—Apparently it is impossible; because on the Continent they have outlets for their meat. Germany, it is quite well known, only sends us about the number of animals that she imports; and it will be a question, of course, with Germany how much of that number she will send to England as dead meat, and how much she will send to Paris, and other continental markets, as live meat.

366. I suppose the same state of things exists now that existed, if I remember rightly, at the time of the examination before the last Committee, in which it was shown that truck-loads of cattle sent to market from abroad came as far, I think, as Mayence, and waited there for a telegraphic communication as to the prices in Paris and London before deciding to which market they should be sent?—That system still continues. The importers are commonly concerned pecuniarily in the arrangement; some of them are part owners, or at any rate partly responsible for the animals which are to be sent, and they decide themselves on one market day how many they will have over on the next.

367. And therefore if the cost of creating fresh abattoirs abroad for the dead meat trade be added to the cost of carriage under this new system of refrigerators, the combined cost would make the expense of sending to England so much heavier, that practically the meat would all go to Berlin or to Paris?—I should say that, practically, as much would go to the continental markets as could be sold at a remunerative rate, and it would only be in case those markets were glutted that the surplus would be sent to England, and then only on the understanding that they would get more here than they would get from the lowest state of the markets abroad.

368. Practically, it would re-act in that way, and in time we should get a return of the trade from the prices falling in the other continental towns?—I have no doubt that as soon as it was ascertained that meat could be sent over here at such a price as to pay the producer a good percentage, it would be sent.

369. But this would only apply, I imagine, to a sudden stoppage of the trade; a gradual development of a dead meat trade would obviate that, would it not?—It would; but the difficulty still remains as to the establishment of the necessary machinery; for example, in a district like Schleswig and Holstein, from which we receive a large quantity of cattle during the summer season, the animals have been fed on the marshes; the owners, as a rule, are small proprietors; they send to the consignee at the shipping place twos and threes, sometimes as many as six, and sometimes 20 or 30; but it may happen that in any one cargo there may be represented a dozen owners, or even more. The difficulty which presents itself to my mind is this: who is to arrange that the consignee at the landing-place shall be represented by a slaughterman? Who is to arrange that abattoirs shall be built, and all the necessary apparatus provided, so that these threes, and sixes, and twelves, and twenties, of

Chairman—continued.

cattle coming from all parts of the Schleswig and Holstein district shall, instead of being driven into the ship, be driven into the slaughterhouse? The men themselves, the producers of the cattle, are simply powerless in the matter; all that they can do is to get their stock ready for market, and send their animals two or three at a time to the man who is in the habit of receiving them.

370. Therefore, with regard to those countries, and for these reasons, you think that a dead meat market on the other side would not be feasible?—I cannot understand how it could be arranged, unless some persons see an opportunity of making a sufficient per-centage on their capital to induce them to start a company, and to make the necessary arrangements.

371. But under the proposal that you have made for stopping the import from scheduled countries of the whole of the German and Belgium import, do you contemplate a dead meat trade being set up there?—I think a certain proportion of the animals which we should otherwise get would be sent, just as we get now a certain quantity of dead meat from Germany and from all other ports, even when there is a live trade.

372. I suppose the freight for dead meat is less than for live stock, is it not?—Considerably.

373. That would be a saving?—That would be a saving, but that would not account for the origin of the machinery by means of which the dead meat is to be conveyed. It is the initial difficulty which I see. If the ships were already prepared to receive the meat, and the abattoirs were built on the landing-place at Tonning, or at Hamburg, for the purpose of slaughtering animals there, I can understand that the owners of cattle might send them to the abattoirs instead of sending them on board ship; but until some arrangements are made by somebody, certainly not by the owners themselves, who would not have even any idea how to set about it, I fail to see how a trade could be even commenced.

374. That applies to Schleswig-Holstein?—Yes, that applies to Schleswig and Holstein, and to all other parts of Europe.

375. But under those circumstances you practically will stop the importation of meat altogether from the German source?—I expect that we should get a very small amount of dead meat sent from Germany as compared with the quantity of meat which is represented by the live cattle.

376. On that point can you state to the Committee the number on which we rely that come from that source?—From Germany during 1876 we had 69,988 cattle.

377. Those were all fat cattle sent over here for slaughter, were they not?—Yes; I do not believe that such a thing as German store stock is known.

378. Then, practically, you represent that that would be the loss of stock for the immediate supply that would take place in case the import was dealt with as you suggest?—I believe that we should get so much of it as could be sent to this country, so as to command a higher price than it would fetch as live meat abroad.

379. Then you think that that raises a difficulty as regards the supply of the metropolis?—Considering that something like 45 per cent. of the whole foreign supply comes into the Metropolitan Market, I imagine that it would raise a considerable difficulty.

380. Then we come to another objection or

Professor *Brown.*

11 May 1877.

Chairman—continued.

difficulty to the scheme which you have suggested as the only means, or the best alternative that you can suggest, for the prevention of the introduction of cattle plague?—Yes; but I should feel compelled to face that difficulty, in consideration of the advantage that we should get in the security from these outbreaks which are so annoying and disastrous.

381. In that case, do you propose dealing with sheep and swine from that country in the same way, or would you allow them to come in?—Speaking solely in reference to cattle plague, I should allow them to come in as under the present system, for the reasen that we have not had any outbreak in this country traceable to either sheep or swine.

382. Do you think that they should be slaughtered?—No. They should be detained at the place of landing for 12 hours, and then allowed to circulate over the country. I am speaking solely in reference to cattle plague.

383. That has been the practice as to Russia, from whence you prohibit entirely the importation of cattle?—We do not allow Russian sheep

Chairman—continued.

to be landed except for slaughter, and then they must come in vessels by themselves.

384. Do you propose that the existing state of things, with regard to sheep and swine, should continue until the cattle plague was announced as having broken out in one of those countries, but that the importation of cattle themselves should be entirely forbidden?—That is my proposition; my ground being that I see no way of preventing the introduction of cattle plague so long as live cattle are allowed to come from Germany. The alternative to slaughtering on this side of the water is naturally slaughtering on the other side of the water.

385. Therefore, really, the total loss that you would have to face is about from 50,000 to 60,000 head of cattle, which loss wou be diminished, to a certain extent, by any dead meat trade that might be created in its stead?—I believe so, and I am under the impression that no arrangement for a dead meat trade would be made in Germany, in consequence of the general impression which would exist there that such restrictions as we impose could only exist for a time; there would be perpetual efforts to get those restrictions removed.

Tuesday, 15th May 1877.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Major Allen.	Mr. French.
Mr. Anderson.	Sir George Jenkinson.
Mr. Assheton.	Colonel Kingscote.
Mr. Jacob Bright.	Sir Rainald Knightley.
Mr. Cameron of Lochiel.	Mr. Norwood.
Mr. Chaplin.	Mr. Pease.
Mr. James Corry.	Mr. Arthur Peel.
Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.	Mr. Ritchie.
Mr. Elliot.	Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.
Mr. W. E. Forster.	Mr. Torr.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON, BART., IN THE CHAIR.

The Count C. F. DANNESKIOLD-SAMSOE, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

386. YOU are prepared, I believe, to give evidence before this Committee with regard to the question of the cattle in Denmark?—Yes.

387. Do you come over to this country representing the Agricultural Society of Denmark?—I do.

388. Could you tell this Committee whether cattle plague has existed in Denmark during recent years?—Not since the year 1772, but in the Duchy of Holstein it existed in 1813 and 1814.

389. Was that the last outbreak of cattle plague in your country?—That was the last outbreak.

390. Since that you have never had, in any part of Denmark, a return of the disease?—No.

391. Have you had any visitations of pleuro-pneumonia in Denmark?—Yes, in 1848, and in 1861. On both occasions the epizootic was confined to one single farm; the animals were immediately slaughtered, and the farm placed under strict quarantine.

392. On both those occasions, did that disease spread in the country?—No, it was localised to the farm where the outbreak first occurred.

393. It was absolutely localised to the farm where it originated, and the precautions which were taken were sufficient to prevent its spreading?—Yes.

394. With regard to the other complaint, foot-and-mouth disease, have you had any experience of that in Denmark?—Certainly, several times. In 1841 to 1842 the disease appeared in Jutland and some of the islands. In 1859 some sporadic cases occurred in the Island of Funen only. The disease appeared in Copenhagen in 1862, and some sporadic cases occurred in different parts of the country. Then, from August 1869 until March 1871, the disease was spread over the greater part of the country. Since then some sporadic cases have occurred; in 1872, altogether 19 cases occurred on four farms, of which in the aggregate the whole stock consisted of 60 heads; in 1873, there were four animals affected on one farm, the stock consisting of 80 head; in 1874, there were eight animals affected out of 40 on two farms; in 1875, there were 130 animals affected out of 147 on 13 farms; in 1876, there was one case on one farm, but in what number of stock I do not know.

Chairman—continued.

395. And that was the only case, that you are aware of, as existing in your country in 1876?—Yes.

396. Then we may gather from that, that the precautions taken to stamp out the foot-and-mouth disease were in each of these years effectual?—Yes. Before 1875, the foot-and-mouth disease came under the less severe rules as to diseases; but, since 1875, it has been put under the same class of severe rules as pleuro-pneumonia and cattle plague, &c.

397. In consequence of there having been a larger outbreak, as shown by the number of animals attacked in 1875, your Government placed the foot-and-mouth disease in the same category as pleuro-pneumonia?—Exactly.

398. And the effectual result of that is shown in the Return for 1876?—Exactly. The foot-and-mouth disease was in 1875 rather dangerous in some other countries, so our Government thought it right to carry through as severe a law as possible.

399. Being anxious to maintain your character for exemption from disease, you made your law more strict on the complaint breaking out in foreign countries?—Yes.

400. Can you give the Committee a history of the laws and measures which you have adopted in Denmark concerning these diseases?—Yes; I have had the most essential laws and rules translated for the Committee, and I beg to hand them in. (*The same were delivered in,* see *Appendix.*) I should like to call the attention of the Committee to the fact that sheep-pox and sheep-scab, &c., have always been subject to similar laws and rules as pleuro-pneumonia. That will be seen from the first-named law, that of 29th December 1857; and, since 1875, the foot-and-mouth disease has been

Count *Danneskiold-Samsoe.*

15 May 1877.

Count *Danneskiold Samsoe.*

15 May 1877.

Chairman—continued.

been included under the more severe provisions of that law. This law of 29th December 1857 forms the basis of our legislation on the subject of infectious diseases in domestic animals.

401. That Order relates to the laws and regulations with regard to your home stock?—Yes. Besides this, there are general instructions for the treatment of infectious cases in domestic animals, and also special instructions concerning the foot-and-mouth disease and the pleuro-pneumonia.

402. All the regulations, of course, relate to any outbreak taking place in your country?—They do. Then we have also laws to prevent the plague, or any disease, from coming into the country, and laws and rules to prevent any disease from going out of our country. I have also here the most essential rules translated; as, for instance, "Order concerning measures against importation of cattle plague from Germany." Then there is a law concerning the export of domestic animals from Denmark.

403. Can you give the Committee an idea of the regulation or law which prevents the import across your frontier of foreign cattle?—Yes; that is the Order concerning measures against the importation of cattle plague from Germany, of 16th January 1877. It is as follows: "Inasmuch as the cattle plague has appeared in Germany, the Home Office has decided, in virtue of the Infectious Diseases of Domestic Animals Act of 29th December 1857, Article 9, to order the following measures in order to prevent this disease being brought into the country, viz.: Article 1. Importation into this country from Germany of horned cattle, sheep, goats, or undressed parts of these animals, such as hides or skins, whether dried or salted, horns, hoofs, wool, hair, meat not smoked, tallow not melted, &c., is prohibited. No cattle truck, foreign or Danish at this moment being abroad, may be brought across the frontier of Jutland."

404. Do you mean by that that you do not allow any truck which has carried cattle across the frontier to return into Denmark?—No, not even our own may return.

405. They are absolutely prohibited from coming back?—Yes; "All other domestic animals than those above mentioned on arriving from Germany must be disinfected before being imported."

406. That relates to horses and poultry, I suppose?—Yes, and such things.

407. Do you restrict at all the importation of fodder, or straw, or *emballage* of any sort?—Certainly; the article proceeds as follows: "Likewise all hay and straw from Germany is to be disinfected before importation, unless it serves as packing, properly speaking, for goods which are not themselves likely to carry infection, being placed in baskets, barrels, or boxes, in which the goods are transported, or tied round the merchandise, in which case the hay or straw may be unloaded and delivered to the importer without previous disinfection, on the condition that the latter immediately after reception of the goods causes them to be unpacked, and the packing to be disinfected or burnt under the supervision of the veterinary police." It is always burnt when it is infected.

408. You go so far as to deal even with the straw or hay that forms part of the package of goods?—Exactly.

Chairman—continued.

409. And you force them, if coming from one of those countries, to be disinfected?—Exactly.

410. And you would represent that those regulations, as against Germany and the Continent, have been entirely effective in preventing the introduction of disease into your country?—I think I can say so, because we have had none.

411. Have you any regulations of the same nature as against the import of cattle from other countries, such as Sweden?—The Government has permission to forbid the import as soon as there is any serious disease in any other country. That is the law, and it has been carried through several times against Germany, and against Great Britain, when there has been any serious disease here; in Sweden also there has been sheep pox during two years, and we were not allowed to import from Sweden.

412. On the outbreak of any of these other diseases, besides cattle plague, you stop the import from any country where it has broken out?—Yes; and from Russia all importation of animals has been totally stopped since 1869.

413. Does that include, besides animals, the importation of hides, hoofs and things of that sort, from Russia, or are they admitted?—No, they are not admitted. The Order applied to Prussia in 1869 is in all essential points identical with the one above mentioned of 16th January 1877.

414. These being your laws against importation, what are your regulations for the stamping out of disease, supposing that it should arise in the country?—We have, for instance, a regulation to be observed with regard to pleuro-pneumonia which is among those which I have put in.

415. You represent that these internal regulations for dealing with the disease of pleuro-pneumonia have, as you state to the Committee, been effectual in stamping it out at once on its introduction into the country?—We think that it must be the case, as we have had pleuro-pneumonia twice, and both times we have localised it to the farm where it had its outbreak; and we believe that that is on account of the good law that we have got.

416. I believe that you have also certain strict regulations with regard to the export of cattle from your country?—Yes. This is a law concerning the export of domestic animals from Denmark, dated 25th February 1876: "The Government is authorised to take such measures as may be found necessary, in order to prevent that domestic animals are exported from this country which are, or may be suspected, to be affected with contagious diseases; and also to prevent that the animals sent to foreign countries from Denmark are exposed to such diseases in their journey to their destination." Then there is an Order of the 26th February 1876: "In pursuance of the authorisation granted to the Government by the law of the 25th of this month, concerning measures with regard to the exportation of domestic animals from Denmark, the following provisions are hereby ordered in respect of export of domestic animals to Great Britain."

417. Will you state to the Committee what are the principal regulations by which you deal with cattle which are on the point of being exported; are they allowed to be embarked without any restriction?—Certainly not. "Every head of cattle which is intended for shipment to Great Britain must, before it is brought on board, be examined

Chairman—continued.

examined at the expense of the sender by a veterinary surgeon authorised for the purpose by the local prefect of police, and must not be shipped unless it is proved by examination not to exhibit any symptom of any infectious disease; and unless there is no other reason for suspecting it of being infected with any such disease, to which effect a certificate is to be given by the veterinary surgeon."

418. Do you allow the cattle when they come down to the port of embarkation to mix together, or do you keep the different herds brought from different districts separate before they are examined?—"At the examination of the animals the different droves are to be kept separate in such a manner as to prevent an infectious disease, which might possibly exist in one of them from being transferred to the others."

419. So that, as well as your regulations with regard to the import into your country, you have very strict regulations regarding the export trade out of it?—Yes.

420. Those regulations, as far as the returns are concerned, have been very fairly successful, have they not?—Yes, I think so.

421. There has not been any importation of disease from the country during the last few years, with the exception of one reported case of foot-and-mouth disease?—No.

422. And that took place in 1875, did it not?—In 1875, I think, according to the Blue Book that I have seen, the Annual Report to the Privy Council.

423. Was that the time when you had the foot-and-mouth disease in Denmark?—It was; and that was just at the time when the Government adopted these severe regulations putting it into the same class as pleuro-pneumonia.

424. At that time did your vessels that carried cargo touch at any other ports on their journey?—It is very seldom that they touch at any other ports; they generally go direct.

425. But there was no Order at that time preventing them from touching anywhere?—No, I do not think there was.

426. Has there been an Order of that sort passed subsequently?—I think there has not been a regular law to prevent them. The Government has pointed out to the shipowners how important it is to them to be very careful about this question; but I do not think there is any law about it.

427. Can you tell the Committee what the numbers are as to export from the country?—I have made a list of our exports from 1866 to 1876, which I beg to hand in. (*The same was delivered in.*) That shows that from 1866 to 1870 our export to Great Britain was about the same: it was 8,900 cattle in 1866, 6,100 in 1867, 4,500 in 1868, 6,100 in 1869, and then 8,500 in 1870; but since 1870 to 1876 it has very much increased, because in 1876 it was 57,900 as the total export of cattle to Great Britain.

428. And the number of sheep was 58,200?—58,200, as against 5,300 in 1870.

429. Would you kindly give the intermediate years between 1870 and 1876, showing the rise of the exports of cattle during those years?—In 1870, there were 8,500; in 1871, there were 13,400; in 1872, there were 19,000; in 1873, there were 26,300; in 1874, there were 26,300; in 1875, there were 50,200; and, in 1876, there were 57,900.

Chairman—continued.

430. So that it has been a steadily progressing trade in the last few years?—Yes. The export of sheep in 1870 was 5,300; in 1871, it was 9,800; in 1872, it was 14,000; in 1873, it was 20,000; in 1874, it was 13,700; and then it rose to 55,200 in 1875; and then, again, to 58,200 in 1876.

431. Can you tell the Committee what were the ports to which these cattle were principally exported from Denmark?—Especially Newcastle-upon-Tyne, London, Thames Haven, and Leith. In 1876, the number sent to Newcastle was 33,920; to London it was nearly 16,000; and to Leith it was 7,800; then comes Hull with only 330.

432. Your exportations to Leith in 1876 being nearly 8,000, to London 16,000, and to Newcastle-on-Tyne 33,920, were those about the proportions in 1874?—I am sorry to say that I have not taken out the figures as to 1874, but those will be found in the Annual Report to the Privy Council.

433. Are you aware that at that time the export from Denmark to London, for instance, as compared with these other ports was very small, and that to London, in 1874, there were only 3,173 head of cattle imported as against 15,000 to Newcastle; whereas the export to London has now risen in 1876 to 16,000, as you have stated, showing a great increase in the export from your country to this particular market?—Yes.

434. Can you give the export to other countries from Denmark?—Yes; our export to other countries is only to the Duchies of Schleswig and Holstein, and that is an export for the most part of lean cattle which are fattened on grass in the Duchies.

435. Are they sent down to the pastures of Schleswig-Holstein?—Yes. I put this just to show that the export to the Duchies is the same now as it was in 1866; it is only to England that the export has increased. In 1866, there were 45,900, and it has varied down to about 35,400; and in 1875, it was again 45,400.

436. So that the export trade to Schleswig and Holstein has been steady, whilst the export to Great Britain has almost bounded up?—It has bounded up; it has increased nearly sevenfold within the last six years. To other countries there is scarcely any export, because these two numbers make 95,000, and our total export is 97,000, and that only leaves 2,000 to all other countries.

437. Have you the same restrictions and regulations with regard to cattle going out of your country into Schleswig, that you have with regard to cattle leaving your country for Great Britain?—Not unless there is any disease in our country, and then the Germans, of course, would require it.

438. You do not take the same precautions on the frontier that you take on the seaboard, that is to say, you do not have the cattle inspected before they leave the country, the herds being kept separate?—No, I do not think so.

439. But you represent that your regulations with reference to the import of cattle and other articles into your country render it most improbable that disease should originate in your country, and that, should it originate, you take every precaution with regard to the export to protect this country?—Certainly we do.

440. Is there any other point that you would wish to put before the Committee?—I do not know

Count *Danneskiold-Samsoe.*

15 May 1877.

Chairman—continued.

know that there is any other point that I should wish specially to remark upon.

441. Has this trade which has sprung up with Great Britain at all altered the history of your home farming; have the Danish farmers gradually brought themselves to alter their system of farming, so as to meet the increased export that was coming upon them?—To a certain extent, no doubt, because in former days there was very little export, and most of the farmers were dairy farmers; since 1870 and 1871, we have had a very good market here in England, and then, of course, agriculturists took to breeding and fattening for export, and these numbers show that the farmers have taken very much to that in these later years, because it was evident that it paid pretty well; and, of course, we should be very sorry to lose this good export trade to Great Britain.

442. It would alter the whole system on which you have begun the rearing of cattle?—If it should be prohibited to send live cattle to England, I think I may say that we should have so much difficulty to overcome that probably the farmers would soon go over to the dairy system again, because of the obstacles that would be in their way.

443. Do you think that there would be any possibility of establishing a dead-meat trade as from your country to this country?—I do not think so; we should have many difficulties to get over. For instance, nearly two-thirds of the cattle that we send over here, we send between the months of April and September, that is in the warmer season; and our country is not a regular ice country; we cannot be sure of ice; we can be sure of ice perhaps every third or fourth or fifth year, but there are several years when we have no ice, and then we should have to buy ice from Sweden and Norway, and that would, of course, be very difficult.

444. You mean that it will increase the expense so much that you would not be able to compete in the market here as a dead-meat trade, looking at the price of your cattle at home, if you added to it these additional expenses?—No, because the farmers' taxes and rents are so high that they would have no profit when they sold their dead meat in the harbour, there would be no margin to pay for the transport and other charges.

445. There would be no margin for the extra expenses which would be thrown on the country in creating a dead-meat trade?—Exactly.

446. Can you give the Committee the price per pound of your cattle in the country?—It is very difficult to put any certain price, because a very great proportion of what we sell are lean cattle, and a great part, again, are half fed, and then there are fat cattle; and that, of course, varies the price immensely.

447. What you represent is, that the price of the cattle is in excess of the price of the American trade, and that therefore you could not, as the American trade seems to be able to do, compete in the market after the additional cost had been thrown upon you?—Certainly not, because the pasture in America is so excellent for fattening, it is much better than ours; and the rents in America, and the taxes on the properties, are so much lower than ours that of course they can produce the meat much cheaper than we can. Our taxes are nearly as high as they are in England.

Mr. *Arthur Peel.*

448. When vessels bring cattle from Denmark to this country, are the vessels, on their return, disinfected, or is any precaution taken to secure that the plague is not brought back from Great Britain to Denmark?—It is always the case that as soon as they come back from England they are inspected by a veterinary surgeon, and they are disinfected.

449. Can you state what is the proportion of store and fat stock which is exported from Denmark to Great Britain?—According to our statistics not half of them are fat stock.

450. Do I correctly understand you to say that you import no cattle into Denmark?—We import some cattle; we import between 10,000 and 14,000.

451. Where do they come from?—Chiefly from Sweden; the rest come from England, for breeding purposes, bulls, and so on.

452. But you import none from Germany and Russia, under any circumstances?—From Russia, since 1869, the import has been completely prohibited, and we import very little from Germany.

Colonel *Kingscote.*

453. Before all this export trade with England sprung up, was it not the case that you often killed your calves?—We killed our calves generally.

454. Merely because you could make a better trade in butter than by breeding meat?—Exactly, we would not give them the milk because we preferred to use the milk for butter and cheese. We usually killed them, and we have been often blamed by Englishmen who visited our farms. Now we seldom kill them, because we breed and fatten; we kill them much less, at any rate.

Mr. *Anderson.*

455. Since you prohibited the import from Russia have you had any rinderpest?—We have not had rinderpest since 1772; not in this century.

456. But you had it in the last century?—We had a very grave disease, and we suppose it to have been rinderpest; but we cannot tell whether it was the same cattle plague that you call rinderpest now.

457. Did you prohibit your importation from Russia in the fear of rinderpest coming from there?—Exactly.

Mr. *Elliot.*

458. If you sent dead meat from Denmark instead of lean cattle, would not that pay the farmer?—No; it is impossible to kill the lean cattle with profit.

459. But they would grow fat instead of remaining lean, would they not?—It is a great question whether we should be able to do that.

460. Your pasturage is good enough, is it not?—No, our pasturage is not good; but we fatten in the stable; there are very few places in our country where we can really fully fatten on pasture.

Mr. *Jacob Bright.*

461. Is there any special reason that you can assign for the sudden and extraordinary increase in importation into this country since 1870?—Because farmers have taken to fattening; they did not at all understand or know what fattening was in former days; and because the market was very good here in England, so that it became advantageous

Mr. *Jacob Bright*—continued.

advantageous to them to sell here. The free import that we have in England, especially as it is not allowed from several other countries, gave them a good opportunity for breeding, fattening, and exporting.

462. Is it likely that there will still be a large increase of exportation from Denmark?—Yes, I should say so, and I think that, the prices being as good here as in the Duchies, even our exports of lean cattle to the Duchies might very likely go this way if you had any want of them here.

463. Have you at all considered the possibility of introducing dead meat from Denmark instead of live cattle?—We have considered the question since March 1876. For two years we have been considering the question in our society, and at many meetings all over the country, and we have come to the conclusion that at present it would be impossible, or very difficult, because of the great risk in going into a new trade; besides, the art or secret of preserving the meat is not known to us, and I do not know if it is proved that even the Americans can go on the whole summer; and then, as I mentioned, the greater part of our import is during the summer months, when we could not be sure of having ice. Then, too, the exporters who buy in our country are not one or two great men, but it is in the hands of many, and that makes it more difficult for them to build these big buildings, to have new stables built with new slaughtering places, and new ships, and all that is required.

464. You said that the absence of ice would be a difficulty; but you do not consider that the only difficulty; you consider that there are other difficulties?—Yes; there would be many other difficulties.

465. At present your importation to this country is free; you are not a scheduled country?—No.

466. What effect would it have upon trade if your cattle were obliged to be slaughtered at the port of landing in England, instead of being allowed to come free into the country; would that have an injurious effect upon the importation?—It would, certainly. The farmers are very much afraid of that, because they do not believe that they will have a sufficient profit then so that they can go on with the trade; because that would entail a loss of several per cent.; and as their present rate of profit does not allow any more loss, I do not think that they would be able to go on.

467. When you say that you would lose so much per cent. by slaughtering at the port of landing, are you speaking from experience; do you know it to be the case?—That is what the farmers have been calculating. I, personally, do not exactly understand it; but people of experience, who have been studying the question and who have been calculating the prices, and know, for instance, what is the price received at Deptford and other places, are of that opinion.

Mr. *Assheton.*

468. I think you told the Chairman just now that the expense of a dead meat export trade, as compared with the expense of a live stock trade, would prevent the dead-meat trade from being adopted; I should like to know a little more clearly what are these extra expenses that you contemplate?—The difficulties, the obstacles, and the expenses.

Mr. *Assheton*—continued.

469. You say that a dead-meat trade would be more expensive; I want to know what those extra expenses are with a dead-meat trade, as compared with a live stock trade?—We should be obliged to have several extensive slaughtering places. Of course it must be in the hands of one or more large companies; and they would have to build stores and houses, and provide ice, and so on; and the ships must be constructed specially for that purpose, as far as I know. Of course that would augment the expenses of the export, as far as we can understand.

470. To what ports do you send cattle now?—We send them to Newcastle and to Leith, London, and Hull.

471. How long are the cattle in transit from Denmark to those ports?—It depends upon where they leave the country. We have 10 ships that go continually with cattle all the year round, and from six or seven different harbours. When they go from Copenhagen they take about three days and three nights on an average. When they go from Esbjerg a new harbour which we have built on the west coast of Jutland, they only take 36 hours to go down to Thames Haven; that is half the time.

472. Do you provide the cattle with food and water on board?—Yes.

473. In estimating the expenses of the two trades, has it never occurred to you that a live bullock with its food and water occupies considerably more space on board ship than the dead carcase of a bullock would occupy?—Yes, I dare say it would.

474. Do you not think that that would be an element which would make the dead-meat trade less expensive than the live stock trade?—Of course that is also a question which we have been considering in our country, but we do not think that that would make all the difference. For instance, all the offal would then not be sent, and it would fetch a very small price in our country; because where the harbours are and where the slaughtering place would be, there is a very small poor population who would buy it. We should have the greatest loss in selling it in our country. Esbjerg, for instance, from which the greatest export would take place, is on the west coast of Jutland, in a very thinly-populated part of the country; I think that would be a great loss.

475. Of course it is a balance of difficulties; I understand you to say that one difficulty in a dead-meat trade would be that you would have to provide slaughtering places, and that another difficulty would be that your offal in Denmark would not be worth so much as it would be in England?—No, certainly not, and another difficulty is that we have no reliable supply of cheap ice; I think that is also a question of great importance, especially as regards the transport in the summer months.

476. Now I want you to consider whether there would not be advantages on the other hand. I think you say that you provide food and water for the cattle in transit; that expense would be saved if you killed them on the other side, would it not?—Certainly.

477. Then, again, you say that the live bullock with its food and water occupies considerably more space on board ship than the dead carcase would?—No doubt.

478. Considering these advantages on each side

Mr. *Assheton*—continued.

side, do you still adhere to your belief that a dead meat-trade would be more expensive than a live stock trade?—Decidedly; because it is not my personal opinion that I express, but it is the opinion of farmers in our country, after having considered this question with both its advantages and disadvantages during a couple of years. Of course I can only express what the farmers at present believe; they do not know this new trade, and that is their opinion about it. In the course of some years, when it is known more fully, I cannot say that it is impossible that that trade should ever take place; I can only express the opinion of the farmers in the country at present, and I believe, according to that feeling, a great number of them would take to the dairy system, because the difficulties would be considerably less in changing to the dairy from the fattening system; it does not require so much outlay of money.

Mr. *W. E. Forster.*

479. You export about 45,000 cattle to Schleswig-Holstein, I think?—Yes.

480. Are they for consumption in Schleswig-Holstein?—No, they are for fattening on their pastures.

481. And then, I suppose, they are exported from there to the German market?—I do not know; the Duchies do not belong to Denmark; I think that the great export goes from Töning to Great Britain; so far as I know, that is one of the places from which they send a great deal over to England.

482. That quite confirms my knowledge of the subject; that some of your cattle come direct, and some go through Schleswig, being fattened there?—Exactly; I think that most of them go to England.

483. How old are the cattle that you sent to Schleswig generally when you send them?—They are generally three or four years old.

484. Supposing that you were prevented from sending your cattle to England, do you think you would send more to Schleswig?—I do not think so, because during these last 11 years they have always bought the same quantity, that is as much as they want to fill their pastures.

485. Have you ever seen any Danish cattle sold for the Paris market, or for the French market?—I do not think so. For instance, in 1866, the export was altogether from our country, 45,900 to Schleswig and Holstein, and 8,900 to Great Britain, the total export being 55,800. Every year there are between 1,000 and 2,000 sent to other countries.

486. Are these figures that you give us what you have obtained from Denmark?—These figures which I give you are the statistics from Denmark, and answer exactly to the same which you receive here in the Annual Report to the Privy Council. I have received them from Denmark from the Agricultural Society.

487. I merely ask that question, because it is a pleasure to find that the statistics from the two different sources, from our office, and from your side, agree?—It is from our offices at home that I state all these figures; only for the last year, 1876, we have not yet made it up completely at home, and that I have taken out of the English Report.

488. I think you stated, in answer to the honourable Member for Manchester, that you thought it would be a decided loss if your cattle were obliged to be slaughtered at the port of landing?—I think so.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

489. Do you at all know whether it would be considered to be a loss that these cattle coming to London should be slaughtered at the foreign market at Deptford, rather than that they should go on to the general market in London?—I do not think I can answer that question.

490. With regard to your export of cattle to England, the ships are specially fitted up for the cattle trade, are they not?—They are. There have been several ships built for the purpose of late years.

491. And they carry no other cargo, I think?—Very little other cargo.

492. I used to hear that you so managed your trade that the cattle generally arrived in good health in England?—Yes, I think we can say that they arrive in pretty good health here.

493. You do not know the average length of the voyage from Denmark to London, do you?—From Esbjerg it is 36 hours, so far as I know, but when the ship goes from the east coast of Zealand, which is much further, it takes three days and three nights.

494. It is the case, as I have heard, that the cattle are put down, as it were, in sand, so that they find an easy sort of bed?—I am informed by the gentleman who is our veterinary adviser, and who has very often been on board, that generally there is sand.

495. With regard to your regulations for foot-and-mouth disease, you had the foot-and-mouth disease in 1875 rather badly in Denmark, had you not?—Yes.

496. Do you know whether, in order to stamp out foot-and-mouth disease, all movement of cattle in Denmark was stopped for any time?—No, it was not the case, because we had only 13 farms in the whole country that were infected, and every farm was put under quarantine, and a complete cordon was formed round it; so that it was not necessary to prevent the freedom of movement.

467. I understand from that that, although the foot-and-mouth disease was prevailing, it did not affect more than 13 farms?—It only affected 13 farms. Our country is of small extent, and there are many islands, so that of course there is not this network of railways; and it is much easier for the executive to control transport and to look after the animals.

498. Are your farms generally large or small?—Our farms are both large and small. The peasant farms, as we call them, which form the majority, are about the size of ordinary English farms, averaging from 40 to 100 acres; but the higher class of farms are much larger, reaching to 1,000, 1,200, and 1,500 acres.

499. When you speak of the foot-and-mouth disease being on 13 farms, do you think that many of those 13 farms were large farms?—No, they were small farms. I have given the number of the cattle in those 13 farms so that you will be able to see that. There were 147 cattle in those 13 farms, and, out of those, 130 were affected that year.

500. Were the 13 farms in the same district?—They were all in the Island of Zealand; but I must say that two of the cases occurred in the harbour of Esbjerg in Jutland; two bulls just imported from Great Britain were found to suffer from the foot-and-mouth disease and were killed immediately in the harbour; so that the foot-and-mouth disease did not really exist in Jutland. Therefore I ought to have said that there were altogether 128 cases in the Island of Zealand.

Professor GEORGE THOMAS BROWN, recalled; and further Examined.

Chairman.

501. I SHOULD like to ask you first, whether you have had any further intelligence since our last meeting with regard to the outbreak in Hull?—I received a letter this morning from the town clerk of Hull, in answer to inquiries which I addressed to him last week, chiefly with the view of finding out if anything had transpired which would lead to the impression that cattle plague had existed between the 22nd of March and the 5th of May, on which date the last outbreak is presumed to have occurred; and he says that, excepting those sheds where the cattle plague had been, none have been found empty; that is to say, in no case had any stock been removed, neither has any circumstance transpired which can be taken as evidence of the disease having existed there between the 22nd of March last and the 5th instant; further, he states two other cows which came into Hull, along with, and from the same place as, the cow attacked at Kirby's, have been traced by us, and are reported both to be healthy and doing well.

502. That letter, then, confirms your own idea as opposed to the post-mortem examination?—It does.

503. You consider that this outbreak was not really an instance of cattle plague?—It very materially strengthens the collateral evidence which is opposed to the idea of these cases being cattle plague.

504. With regard to the metropolis, have you had any fresh cases reported there?—We have had several cases reported during the last 10 days, but in every instance, on inquiry, they have turned out to be cases of other diseases.

505. What are your measures now in force?—The measures which are now in force are contained in the Order which came into operation on the 16th April, on which date the Privy Council took the action of the local authority in reference to cattle plague; subsequently, in consequence of information having been obtained of the removal of cows from Middlesex, near where cattle plague had broken out, to country markets, and from the further fact which was ascertained, that cows marked for slaughter in the Metropolitan Market had been bought by dealers and transferred to cowsheds in the metropolis, where they were seen by our inspectors, three Orders were passed on the 27th April; the first of those Orders totally closed the county of Middlesex, and prevented movement altogether out of the county, except into the metropolis to a slaughter-house, or to the Metropolitan Market; the second one compelled the slaughter in the market area of all animals sent to the Metropolitan Market; that was for the purpose of avoiding the sales which we found were taking place in the lairs outside the market, whence animals were removed to various premises over which we have no control; this Order also prohibited the movement of animals within the metropolis, except to a slaughter-house named in the license, or to the Metropolitan Market, where they would be slaughtered within the area. In every case the license was not to remain in force more than 12 hours; Orders are now in operation, and these remain in operation until the 1st day of June.

506. And under those Orders you are dealing by the central authority with Middlesex as well as with the metropolitan area?—We are dealing with the whole of the metropolitan police district, which extends for something like 16 to 17 miles round London.

Chairman—continued.

507. With regard to the continuation of the inquiry that we began on the last meeting of the Committee as to the effect of importation on the disease, the general allegation is that the losses from contagious diseases of animals in this country exceed the value of the imported animals, and that those losses are caused by the introduction of foreign stock, and that therefore foreign stock should not be admitted; is not that the allegation?—That is the general allegation. I should propose, in the first place, to avoid any discussion as to the amount of damage done, and to admit all that is alleged in reference to the amount of loss arising from the influence of contagious and infectious diseases. It appears to be a matter, so far as the argument is concerned, of comparative indifference as to the exact amount. There is no doubt whatever that the loss is very serious; but the fallacy which I recognise in the statement exists in the second part of the proposition, which refers the introduction of these diseases to the continued importation of foreign animals. On that point there appears to me to be no satisfactory evidence.

508. That is with regard to pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth-disease?—Exactly.

509. What system would you think necessary in dealing with these diseases?—In reference to cattle plague, as I stated before, the evidence is satisfactory that the disease is introduced by the importation of live animals from abroad. The system of slaughtering at the port of debarkation has failed in every instance. Therefore I should, without hesitation, propose to prohibit the importation of cattle from Germany and Belgium unconditionally.

510. You stated, I think, that the loss to the country would be the loss of German and Belgian cattle, which amounts to about 26,000?—Yes; but that would be compensated for by the amount of meat which they would send us, so long as it paid to send meat to this country.

511. But the probability would be that from Germany, in consequence of the meat being dear in that country, that trade would not form any very important part of our supply?—Yes.

512. It was in consequence of the meat in Germany being dear that you believed that only a small proportion would come to this country?—I think that is a reasonable conclusion.

513. That would limit the proportion with regard to cattle plague, but with regard to pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease, I understood you to say that the prohibition of the importation of foreign stock, in order to stamp out pleuro-pneumonia, should be accompanied by stringent regulations at home?—Undoubtedly, otherwise there is no reason to conclude that the prevalence of these diseases in this country would be materially diminished.

514. As long as the free movement in the country continues, these diseases would remain with us?—Undoubtedly. The allegation which is made respecting free trade in disease applies strictly to the movement of animals in the United Kingdom; it does not apply to the movement of animals

Professor *Brown.*

15 May 1877.

Professor *Brown.*

15 May 1877.

Chairman—continued.

animals from abroad, because the movement of diseased foreign animals which are landed in this country is severely restricted; and if we were to deal with our homesteads as we deal with foreign animals, at the landing places, it is quite certain that before this we should have made a very marked impression upon contagious diseases in general.

515. The introduction of diseases from abroad being irregular and occasional only?—That, I think, is a fair conclusion from the evidence. I refer to the introduction of the disease into the country, and not to its introduction to our ports. The introduction to the ports is regular and constant, but the escape of infected animals, which leads to the introduction of the disease into the interior of the country, is irregular and occasional.

516. That especially applies, does it not, to foot-and-mouth disease, with which a very large number of the animals imported were affected?—Undoubtedly.

517. Can you give the numbers in 1875 and 1876?—During those two years, in round numbers, we had something like 30,000 animals affected with foot-and-mouth disease landed at different ports.

518. Was there any accession to the diseases in the country from that fact?—During those years the disease declined. The decline began in the latter part of 1875, and during 1876 it was common to hear the remark made, "The foot-and-mouth has left us; there are no cases in the country."

519. Can you give the proportion of cattle out of those 30,000?—That includes the whole of the animal landed; the proportions will be found in the Tables in the Report.

520. I suppose you would admit that the importation of disease from foreign parts is occasioned by this irregular spread that you have described, because fresh centres of contagion are set up by it?—Undoubtedly; we add to the number of centres.

521. Is pleuro-pneumonia or foot-and-mouth disease more frequently introduced?—Pleuro-pneumonia, undoubtedly, in consequence of the impossibility of the disease being detected in the stage of incubation by any kind of examination.

522. The incubation of the disease being longer, it is almost impossible to guard against fresh centres of disease being formed in the country?—Quite so, under the present system.

523. What are the measures of prevention which you would suggest, if an attempt is to be made to stamp out both these diseases, beyond the suggestions which you have already made?—I should first propose to deal with the importation of foreign animals; and, in order to do that effectually, it would be necessary to amend the present Act in such a way as to give larger and more elastic powers to the Privy Council.

524. Giving, as you suggested the other day, a power to the Privy Council to appoint inspectors through the country?—To do what the local authority have already done. As I said in my last examination, we should require about 2,000 inspectors; there are already something like 1,800, so that the increase would not be very large. I do not, by the term inspectors, mean in all cases veterinary surgeons. It would be necessary that the country should be divided into districts, and that a competent veterinary surgeon

Chairman—continued.

should have charge of each district, and be in communication with our department.

525. Would you, then, allow the principal work to be done, as it is at present, by the police being appointed as inspectors?—The police and other persons not having professional knowledge, would act very effectively under proper direction.

526. Have you found that to be the case since you have taken the command in the local areas?—We have. We find that the police have given us very considerable assistance, particularly in the early transmission of notices which they receive; they are always in direct communication, by telegraph, with Scotland Yard throughout the whole of the metropolitan district, and sometimes we have had a telegram in a quarter of an hour (from Willesden, for example), after information of the disease has been given to the police at that point.

527. How would the cost of such a scheme be defrayed?—I presume that the cost would be defrayed, as now, by the local authorities.

528. And the expense would be very little greater than the present expense, because, as you say, the scheme would only require a small increase of the inspecting staff?—I should say that the expense would be very little greater than it is at the present time, and not to be compared with the amount of loss which is sustained by the ravages of contagious disease.

529. The advantage would be that you would gain uniformity of action throughout the country?—We should.

530. Are there any other recommendations that you would make under such a system; how do you propose to deal with the question which formed one of the subjects which was considered by the last Committee, viz., that of surplus ships' stores?—Under the head of foreign animals I should propose first of all, to prevent the landing of what are called surplus ships' stores. Animals may be brought from any port abroad, and landed in this country with the certificate of an Inspector of the Privy Council, which certificate is given after such an examination as he can make on board the boat, and is handed to any one who may happen to be at hand; there is no limitation as to its duration, and it may be used a week after it has been given, when the sanitary state of the animals may be very considerably modified.

531. When, in fact, the animals may have been brought in contact with any number of means of communicating disease?—It was a subject of considerable anxiety during the prevalence of cattle plague in the east of London. I knew at that time that butchers engaged about cattle plague animals might go on board a boat in any of the docks and might examine sheep or cattle, and might absolutely infect them with the disease; and they might nevertheless move those cattle two or three days afterwards with the certificate of the inspector who had seen them on their arrival to the effect that they were in perfect health.

532. The limitation as to the dealing with those stores was part of the subject matter of the consideration of the late Committee?—I believe it was.

533. But nothing has been done with regard to that since?—Nothing at all.

534. I understand you to say with regard to Schleswig-

Chairman—continued.

Schleswig-Holstein cattle that you thought they ought, under such a system, to be slaughtered at the port of landing?—Having reference to the possibility of cattle plague entering that country before we are aware of it, I should land them at defined parts of ports in this country for slaughter only.

535. Whilst with regard to countries which are at present unscheduled, such as Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Spain, and Portugal, they would remain as unscheduled?—They would remain as unscheduled.

536. Would you restrict their movement at all?—I should deal with them under the system which I propose to adopt with reference to stock in this country generally, and that would alter their position very much.

537. You would not allow them to go from where they were landed, excepting for slaughter, unless the district was declared free from disease?—I should, first of all, insist upon evidence being given that the country was free from disease, and that the arrangements were of such a character that, in all probability, it would remain free from disease. I should then allow them to be landed at ports where there were proper arrangements for their lairage and, if necessary, for their slaughter; and I should detain them for a longer time than at present; I think that 24 hours should be the minimum period, in order to give the inspectors every opportunity of detecting disease. Then they would only be allowed to go from the place of landing to a fat-stock market. From that market they might be subsequently removed by license to slaughter-houses, or, as the system, which I should hope to see ultimately developed, grew in extent, there would be arrangements in all large towns where fat-stock markets would be held for the slaughtering of all animals exposed for sale in those markets, in proper abattoirs.

538. Would you propose to enforce this system, which you have suggested, by severe penalties in the Act?—Undoubtedly. The only way of getting an order or an Act carried into effect would be by imposing very heavy penalties in case of infringement. So long as the amount of the penalty is less than the profit on the transaction, persons are found to break the law habitually. There are drovers now in the metropolis who have, under our orders, I was told yesterday, been fined 20 or 30 times, and they simply undertake the work partly for the excitement which attends it, and, further, for the remuneration which they obtain if they are successful, with the certainty that no loss can possibly happen to them, because their employers always pay the penalty for them.

539. But if the scheme which you have suggested for stamping out the disease is really to be tried, it must be accompanied by something more severe in the way of penalties than at present exists?—Undoubtedly.

540. That deals with the import of fat stock; how do you propose to deal with the importation of store stock?—My conviction is that foreign store stock, excepting a few animals for breeding purposes, and dairy stock, which I propose to deal with separately, are not required at all.

541. You mean that our breeding power is equal to the amount of feed that we have in this country?—We know that it sometimes exceeds our feeding power; but, in any case, if we want more store stock we may dispense with the use of lamb and veal or get it from abroad, and breed our own stores in that way.

542. I think I understood you to say that, with regard to the supply of dairy stock and other store stock, you propose that it should be only admitted under considerable restrictions as to its condition before it came over?—I think that it should be only allowed to come with a certificate of origin from healthy districts, and that it should be marked in such a way that all the animals could be kept under supervision for some months. I say that chiefly with reference to Dutch cows, which are so much esteemed by dairymen in this country; but I am not at all certain that we could not do without them, and in time I should hope to do so; because, so long as pleuro-pneumonia exists in Holland, it is almost impossible to avoid its introduction into the dairies in London and other towns.

543. You would treat Holland as one of the scheduled countries, slaughtering everything at the port of debarkation?—Slaughtering in all cases the fat stock, and only allowing dairy stock to be introduced under these restrictions.

544. But supposing that you did away with the introduction of dairy stock, what then?—Then I should simply place Holland in the schedule.

545. How would you propose to deal with the stock of the country itself for the purpose of stamping out the disease absolutely?—I think there is no escape from the conclusion that we must entirely interfere with the free movement of stock in this country if we seriously intend to get rid of these diseases.

546. Until these diseases are stamped out?—Until they are entirely stamped out. For that purpose, a general scheme would include the holding of markets for fat stock by license, and the subsequent movement of animals to specified slaughter-houses; store markets must also be held on similar conditions.

547. Practically you would place the most stringent regulations for a time upon the whole movement of cattle in the country, either fat or lean?—Decidedly.

548. For the purpose, as I understand, of stamping out pleuro-pneumonia and foot and mouth disease, which you believe to be epidemic in the country?—They are so far naturalised that, while we are constantly supplying new material in the shape of fresh susceptible animals, the diseases will inevitably continue as they have in other countries quite irrespectively of the importation of fresh animals from abroad.

549. With regard to the cowsheds in large towns, and especially in London, do you believe that those are centres for disease?—I have no doubt at all of that fact. The cowsheds in London, Dublin, Glasgow, Edinburgh, and other large towns are the chief centres of contagious disease, chiefly pleuro-pneumonia.

550. Do you think it would be possible in any way to get rid of those centres of infection in large towns?—I am afraid that it would be very difficult to abolish them entirely, but I think that efforts should be directed to concentrating them as far as possible in the suburbs; and, as far as it could possibly be done, it would be desirable to prevent the conversion of premises of all kinds into cowsheds merely for the purpose of holding three or four cows. A large number of places

Professor *Brown.*

15 May 1877.

Chairman—continued.

exist in London, now without any license, and it is exceedingly difficult to detect an outbreak of disease in them when it does occur.

551. If they are continued, they should be continued under strict supervision?—Under strict supervision, and sanitary arrangements should be insisted upon.

552. In dealing with the outbreaks of pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease, would you make any regulation with regard to the animals that were brought into infected premises?—I think it would be absolutely indispensable that wherever an outbreak is detected (and it would be part of my scheme to make such inquiries that the majority of outbreaks would be detected), the introduction of fresh stock should be prohibited until the disease had entirely ceased. I may mention in that connection that something like half the cases in Middlesex during the past year were kept up on one man's premises by the constant introduction of fresh stock into a shed where pleuro-pneumonia existed.

553. It would be absolutely necessary, therefore, in those cases, to stop any such addition to the stock of the place?—It would.

554. Would you slaughter in the case of pleuro-pneumonia?—I should slaughter without hesitation all the animals which gave any evidence of the disease, and I should deal with the rest of the herd according to circumstances. I should slaughter if the animals were fat and in a fit state for the butcher, or try inoculation, which I have frequently suggested should be tried upon a large scale, so that we may get positive evidence as to its efficacy; and, in any case, I should perfectly separate the animals from all others on the premises, and not allow any fresh stock to be brought in contact with them for two months after the cessation of the disease.

555. That is a system which you suggest as a means of stamping out these diseases, whilst you say that under the present system, though you may limit the diseases, you will never extinguish them?—The present system of slaughtering merely amounts to getting rid of one animal and putting another animal in its place on the following day, and sometimes on the same day; I believe that under that system it is quite vain to hope that the disease would even be materially diminished, although the cost of compensation, even under that arrangement, is excessively heavy.

556. Under your scheme, how would you propose to deal with the Irish stock?—First, Ireland must consent to prohibit importation from all countries, including Great Britain. It would be a matter of small consequence to Ireland; they import very few animals indeed; and, except for breeding purposes, I should prohibit importation entirely.

557. I understand you to say that the present import from Great Britain to Ireland is insignificant?—It is quite unimportant, and it consists chiefly of calves which are got in without observation, and which have taken foot-and-mouth disease to that country repeatedly.

558. The system that you have suggested would introduce a total change into the whole present cattle traffic of the country, would it not?—Doubtless, it would; because under the present system, animals are moved about in all directions, just to meet the exigencies of trade. A man may send animals from the north of England; his neighbour comes to the Metropolitan Market and buys them, and probably takes them all the way back again. I have known instances of a salesman getting an order for several hundred animals to be sent over to France; he has gone down to Southampton and intercepted the animals that were brought over, and sent them back again to the country from which they came. Under this system it is, of course, impossible that infected animals could be prevented from carrying disease in all directions.

Chairman—continued.

559. I suppose that the cost to the country of the change which you have suggested would be considerable?—Undoubtedly it would, for the time.

560. Have you considered what relation it would bear to the losses that fall upon the country from the disease?—I should apprehend that the total cost, as compared with the losses sustained, would really be insignificant. We have no means of absolutely calculating the amount which would be expended, because the system has never been tried.

561. But, notwithstanding the cost, if its result was, as you suppose it might probably be, to stamp out the disease, the saving to the country would be considerably in excess of that cost?—Most certainly.

562. Do you look forward, under this system which you have suggested, to a development of the dead meat trade?—That appears to me to be the point to which all regulations should tend. I cannot imagine that any effective system of dealing with contagious diseases can possibly be continued, unless the dead meat trade very largely indeed takes the place of traffic in live animals.

563. And you think that would be feasible in time?—I have no doubt whatever that it might, so soon as people became converted to the idea, be carried out without any very great difficulty; but for a long time the whole system which I propose would be met by systematic opposition.

564. I suppose that when once you had stamped out the disease under your system, you would then be able to set up the absolute slaughter of foreign animals at the ports?—Having once cleared the country of disease I should propose to run no further risk; and having excluded cattle from Germany and Belgium, as countries through which we might take cattle plague, I should slaughter all other imported animals at the place of landing in this country. I believe that that precaution would effectually preserve us from both foot-and-mouth disease, and pleuro-pneumonia.

565. And by a gradual process of this sort, and a gradual development of the dead meat trade, you would arrive at a state of things which you believe would keep this country free from these diseases?—Presuming that all these regulations could be properly carried into effect.

566. Is there any other point upon which you wish to give evidence?—Nothing more.

Mr. *W. E. Forster.*

567. Your first answer to the Chairman was that you are the professional officer of the Veterinary Department; will you explain to the Committee what that means?—I may best explain that by stating that when Dr. Williams resigned, shortly before his death, the office of secretary was abolished, and we returned to the former

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

former state of things, in which Professor Symonds was the professional head of the Department, and the Lord President, as represented by the clerk of the Council, was the official head. Under the present circumstances, I am in the place which Professor Symonds occupied as the virtual head of the Department, and the Lord President, as represented by the clerk of the Council, is the official head.

568. Then, in fact, in addition to your previous duties as the professional adviser of the Department, you now perform the duties that Dr. Williams used to perform as secretary?—I do.

569. That being the case, I wish to call your attention to the Report of the Committee of 1873, and to ask you if you are able to state whether the recommendations of that Committee have been carried out. The first recommendation is with regard to cattle plague:—"That Section 66 of the English Act, which gives a local authority power, if they think fit, to order the slaughter of any animal which has been in contact with an animal affected with cattle plague, should be so far altered as to make it the duty of the local authority to order such slaughter;" has that alteration been made?—It has not.

570. The next recommendation is: "That discretion should be given to the local authority to order the slaughter of any animals on any premises adjoining those in which the disease exists, upon a certificate of any inspector, being at the same time a duly qualified veterinary surgeon, that such slaughter is necessary to prevent the spread of the disease;" has that recommendation been carried out?—It has not.

571. Does that require an alteration of the Act?—It would require an alteration of the Act.

572. Both those recommendations could only have been carried out by an Act of Parliament?—That is so.

573. Am I right or not in believing that there has been no Act passed since that time, as far as regards English animals?—There has been no Act passed since 1869.

574. In your evidence on Friday last you stated, in answer to Question 17, that you considered that it was very necessary that there should be that power to order the slaughter of animals; has that opinion been confirmed or not by this last outbreak?—It has most certainly been confirmed, for I have no doubt at this moment, from the facts that have transpired since the discovery of the disease in Limehouse, that, had we had full power at the time to order the slaughter of the animals, the disease might easily have been extinguished in less than a month.

575. Upon what particular fact do you base that opinion?—Chiefly upon the circumstance that the disease prevailed for nearly two months in a certain district in the east of London, which was easily marked upon the map, and which could easily have been dealt with if we had had power to slaughter animals on premises which we believed had been exposed to the infection.

576. Of course you did not attempt to do it, because it would have been perfectly illegal for you to have done it?—Quite illegal.

577. That applies to the Recommendation (*b*), I think?—It does.

578. Have you found any evil arising from the alteration contemplated by Recommendation (*a*) not being carried out?—Not during the last outbreak.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

579. That is, I presume, because the local authority with which you had to deal was the Metropolitan Board of Works, who, I suppose, did at once what you wished?—They at once did what we required with reference to the slaughter of animals which had been herded with infected animals, with a single exception. One animal is still in a shed where cattle plague existed; the owner applied to be allowed to keep it as it was a favourite animal, and, in spite of my strong remonstrance at the meeting of the Board, they allowed it to be kept alive.

580. Supposing that the cattle plague had got well out of the Metropolis and into the country districts, I suppose the want of the alteration recommended in Recommendation (*a*) would have been very serious, would it not?—It would have been very serious.

581. I am not, of course, asking you for any opinion that may be held by the heads of the Department, but have any facts come to your knowledge since the Report of the former Committee, that would make it desirable that an Act should not have been passed embodying these recommendations?—I am not aware of any.

582. The next recommendation is, "That compensation should be extended for any animal so slaughtered;" that would, of course, follow naturally from the previous recommendations?—It would be included in the other recommendations.

583. Now I go on to pleuro-pneumonia. The first recommendation with regard to pleuro-pneumonia is: "That the slaughter of all cattle affected with this disease should be compulsory, and that there should be compensation for cattle so slaughtered;" has anything been done to carry out that recommendation?—That recommendation was met by an Order of the 2nd of August 1873, immediately after the Report of the Committee was published.

584. The next recommendation is: "That the Rules in the 7th Schedule of the English Act, should be so altered as to provide that cattle which have been in the same shed, or which have been herded with diseased animals, may be moved under regulations for isolation for two months;" how was that met?—No alteration has taken place in any of the schedules of the Act of 1869.

585. And that could not have been done without an alteration of the Act?—Certainly not.

586. With the experience that you have gained since 1873, what is your opinion with regard to that recommendation?—I have no doubt that it would have had a very beneficial effect.

587. The next recommendation is: "That the power given by Section 54 of the English Act, to an inspector to apply the pleuro-pneumonia rules to any premises in which he finds that disease to exist, should be extended to any premises in which he finds that it has existed within 28 days;" what is your view with regard to that recommendation?—That would have been most important in its operation.

588. Will you state in what way it would have been important?—I may cite a single instance, where an animal was seized some time ago in my presence in the Metropolitan Market; the owner stated that he had 19 others in his shed in the country; the local authorities were informed of it; there was no question of the fact that the animal came from that shed, but as the inspector found all those animals in perfect health he took

Professor *Brown.*

15 May 1877.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

no action. Subsequently the disease was detected, on those premises, but then there were only eight animals left; the remainder had been removed, nobody knew where.

589. What is your view with regard to the next recommendation, "That the time during which the pleuro-pneumonia rules should be applied to any premises in which the disease has been discovered, should be extended from 30 days to two months"?—That is also very desirable.

590. That could not be done without an Act of Parliament?—It could not.

591. You are probably aware that evidence was given before the last Committee which tended to show that it was of very little use to attempt to isolate pleuro-pneumonia cases unless you extended the isolation to two months, because the period of incubation so often lasted that time?—That is the case, and it has been proved to be the cases by repeated instances since.

592. There has been nothing to shake that opinion in the minds of veterinary doctors since 1872?—Nothing at all.

593. But rather to confirm it, I think?—Quite to confirm it. It has been noticed as rather a singular circumstance that so many outbreaks have occurred the day after the pleuro-pneumonia rules had ceased to apply.

594. Then as to sheep-pox, the first recommendation is: "That the slaughter of all sheep affected with sheep-pox should be compulsory with compensation." Has anything been done with regard to that?—No steps have been taken in that direction; we have had no sheep-pox since.

595. Coming now to foot-and-mouth disease the Committee recommended "That the Privy Council should cease to issue orders for the check of this disease. That Section 57 of the English Act, which makes the exposure or carriage of animals affected with a contagious disease an offence, should continue to apply to foot-and-mouth disease, but owners shall be relieved from the necessity of giving notice to the police of the existence of this disease among their stock." Has that been carried out?—As regards Sub-section (*a*), that was done in the same Order of August 1873.

596. But Section (*b*) could not be carried out without an alteration of the Act?—It could not.

597. Has Sub-section (*c*), which contemplated the movement under proper precautions of animals so affected been carried out?—That was carried out in the same Order.

598. The result, I think, of those Orders that were issued in August 1873, was that for a time the action with regard to foot-and-mouth disease was made the same all through the island?—It was.

599. Is that the case now?—The Order of August 1873 in respect of foot-and-mouth disease was almost immediately revoked in consequence of deputations which came from various societies, the Royal Agricultural Society among them, urging that the former restrictions should be re-imposed.

600. When you say that it was almost immediately revoked, when was it revoked?—I forget the exact date, but some two or three months afterwards.

601. It was after a change of Government, was it not?—I think not, but I am not quite sure of that.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

602. The Order was issued in August 1873, was it not?—It was.

603. And in was revoked in March 1874?—I believe it was.

604. The representations were made by different local authorities, were they not?—They were.

605. I think when you were examined before the Committee in 1873 you were of opinions that the restrictions with regard to foot-and-mouth disease, whatever they were, should be the same all through the island?—Decidedly.

606. Now that, by the re-enacting of this Permissive Order, they are different throughout the island, is your opinion changed?—Not in the slightest. My impression then was, and still is, that the action taken to repress foot and mouth disease was merely obstructive without being effectual.

607. You find in the same report, a paragraph with regard to compensation, proposing that the local authority should be empowered to grant compensation "to an extent not exceeding three-fourths of the loss sustained by the owner, provided that it does not exceed 25 *l.* for any animal;" that has been done, has it not?—It has not been done in that form. The local authority are empowered to pay compensation to the extent of three-fourths of the value of the animal in the case of pleuro-pneumonia, but nothing was said about the loss incurred by the owner.

608. There was a doubt, I think, in the mind of the officers of the Department as to whether that could or could not be done without an alteration in the Act?—I understood that there was at the time considerable doubt as to whether it could be done without an alteration in the Act.

609. But the office ruled that they would run that risk and make the compensation?—They did.

610. What have you done with regard to cattle plague?—By the Order of April the 12th we took action in place of the local authorities in the Metropolitan police district.

611. But what compensation do you pay in a case of cattle plague?—Nothing has been done yet since we took the matter in hand, but the local authorities are empowered to pay a sum not exceeding one-half of the value of diseased animals, and three-fourths of the value of those that are herded with them, but are not actually diseased.

612. Am I right in supposing that the compensation for cattle plague is according to the terms of the old Act?—It is.

613. And not in accordance with this recommendation in regard to pleuro-pneumonia?—No.

614. Therefore you are now paying less compensation for cattle plague than you would be for pleuro-pneumonia?—That is so.

615. And that would not have been the case if this alteration in the Act had been made?—No, it would not, certainly.

616. I see that there is a recommendation: "That the regulations with regard to the stoppage of disease should cease to be varying or permissive;" you have already answered that they are varying or permissive at the present time?—They are.

617. But it is not your opinion that there is any advantage in that?—It is certainly a great disadvantage.

618. Then

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

618. Then there is a recommendation with regard to Scotland, that there shall be one local authority for each county; do you know whether anything has been done about that?—I believe that nothing has been done with reference to altering the arrangement respecting local authorities.

619. The Committee also recommended: "That the power of entry, given by Section 32 of the English Act to the inspector or other officer of the local authority when he has reason to suspect the existence of cattle plague, pleuro-pnenmonia, or sheep-pox, should be extended to all contagious diseases except foot and mouth disease." Has that recommendation been carried out?—Nothing has been done in that direction.

620. Have you any reason to suppose that it would have been an advantage to have had that change?—I have no doubt it would in many cases, particularly, perhaps, in reference to glanders, which is often suspected to exist on premises where there is no power to enter.

621. With regard to the recommendation as to Ireland, an Act has been passed, has it not?—An Act has been passed relating to pleuro-pneumonia.

622. How far does that Act carry out these Recommendations (*a*), (*b*), and (*c*)?—It carries out the recommendation in reference to the slaughter of animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia.

623. Does it carry out the recommendation "That the Regulations in Great Britain and Ireland with regard to contagious diseases should be similar"?—It does not.

624. Does it carry out the recommendation "That such Regulations should be carefully enforced at the landing places, both in Great Britain and Ireland"?—It does not.

625. Does it carry out the recommendation "That the Irish Government should take steps, by inspection at Irish ports, to prevent the shipment to Great Britain of any diseased or infected animals"?—The Irish Government have taken steps to inspect animals at Irish ports, but not in consequence of any regulation which has been made by the Privy Council.

626. Then I gather that, looking at the recommendations of that Committee, so far as Great Britain is concerned, no recommendation requiring alteration in the Act has been carried out?—None.

627. And your opinion, that every one of these recommendations ought to be carried out, remains the same as it was in 1873?—It does.

628. And with regard to those recommendations which could be carried out by Order, they were carried out immediately after the passing of the Act?—They were.

629. But, as regards foot and mouth disease, they were revoked about six months afterwards?—They were.

630. With regard to your answer about cattle plague in 1872, the information was obtained in the office, was it not, which led us to expect that we should have an import of cattle plague before the ship really arrived?—It was.

631. Do you recollect how that information was obtained?—I do not remember precisely, but I have an impression that it was given by one of the importers.

632. You stated, I think, in answer to the Chairman, that in 1872 the cattle plague was for three months in one district in the East Riding?—Altogether it remained in the East Riding, in three districts, during that period before it was finally stamped out.

633. Can you give the Committee a notion of the size of those districts?—So far as the area over which cattle plague extended is concerned, I should say that a radius of two miles in each case would include each district.

634. I think that the precautions which were adopted prevented the cattle plague from getting out of those districts?—They did.

635. Do you recollect the number of animals that were slaughtered in the East Riding?—Two hundred and twenty-two animals.

636. Will you be kind enough to hand in a return containing the number, and, so far as you know, the sums paid for compensation for all the animals that were slaughtered in consequence of the cattle plague, in 1872, in the East Riding of Yorkshire and in London?—I will.

637. There was an animal washed ashore, and there was a good deal of fear that that animal might bring disease; but that was not the case, was it?—I think there were something like 48 carcases altogether washed ashore on the Lincolnshire coast, but in no case did any disease arise in consequence.

638. Would you consider that the cattle plague was really bad in Hamburg in 1872?—No; it did not prevail to anything like the same extent that it did on the last occasion.

639. This has been a decidedly worse attack, has it not?—The worst attack that Germany has had since our department has existed, certainly.

640. Do you think that the movement of troops in Russia has had anything to do with it?—From the accounts which we have received, it does not appear to have been in any way connected with the movement of troops. The diseased animals were smuggled over the frontier by one man, who has been imprisoned and subsequently shot in consequence of having made his escape and refusing to answer the sentry's challenge; so that he was not brought to trial, and the chief facts therefore were lost; but there is no doubt that the animals from that frontier were sent right across the country, stopping at several markets, getting first to Breslau, then to Berlin, and then on to Hamburg and other parts.

641. At present the law in Germany entirely prohibits the import of cattle from Russia or Poland, does it?—Entirely.

642. Is that old habit which there used to be of their white cattle going to Moravia to be fed in the distilleries discontinued?—Germany prohibits the introduction of the white or grey breed from any part.

643. But Austria allows them to get into Moravia, does she not?—Austria allows them to get into Moravia.

644. Is there no fear of their getting from Moravia into Germany?—If the regulations are strictly enforced, there should be no fear, because the animals are so very easily recognized.

645. But the regulation that they have in Germany does not prohibit the import of cattle from Moravia, but it simply prohibits the import of these steppe cattle?—Yes.

646. You saw the cattle that came by the "Castor," did you not?—I did.

647. Were they steppe cattle?—They were a mixed

Professor *Brown.*

15 May 1877.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

mixed lot of Polish and Silesian cattle, and half-a-dozen breeds.

648. Were those Polish cattle any of these white or steppe cattle?—No, they were none of them steppe cattle.

649. How do you account for the fact that cattle plague is such a terrible disease in England, and yet that, although it must have existed now, as far as we know, for centuries almost in Russia, it does not seem to diminish the number of the Russian herds?—It appears not to affect the Russian breed to anything like the same extent as it does the English breed, or indeed the animals in the other parts of the continent. Probably the difference of climate has something to do with it, but the recoveries in Russia are stated to be very considerable, sometimes amounting to 75 per cent.

650. With regard to your recommendations to the present Committee, putting aside cattle plague altogether, would you, or would you not, recommend these very stringent regulations that you have just mentioned with regard to pleuro-pneumonia and foot and mouth disease?—Upon the understanding that it is essential, or even that it is economical to get rid of these diseases, I certainly should.

651. In your answers to Questions 341 and 342 in your examination on Friday, you say that you do not believe that the stock owners of the country would comply with the regulations that would be necessary?—That is my conviction. If those regulations were enforced, what people in this country call free trade, that is to say, the right which every man possesses to drive a bullock in any direction he likes, and to any market, and to as many markets as he pleases, must necessarily be totally interrupted, and I do not believe that traders generally would put up with those restrictions.

652. Turning to Question 1461 in your evidence before the former Committee, you were asked this question: "Is there not this difference between the foot and mouth disease and the cattle plague, that not only is the former disease hardly to be compared with the latter in virulence, being so much less virulent, but that while we have great hope of being able absolutely to stamp out the cattle plague, we should have very little hope of absolutely stamping out the foot and mouth disease;" and your reply is: "It is my conviction that we should never succeed in getting rid of it; and that is the experience of the whole of Europe." Do you still adhere to that opinion?—I still retain that conviction from the circumstance that I have just stated, namely, that the restrictions in order to get rid of it must be of such a character that we should never submit to them.

653. Then you are asked at Question 1462: "Therefore, in fact, to preserve ourselves against the foot and mouth disease, we must look forward not only to such stringent restrictions as you say were found very difficult during the cattle plague, but we must look forward to the continuance of them as a general rule, and not to their being laid down as a severe remedy for a temporary disease?" And your reply, "Undoubtedly the restrictions must be permanent." Do you still adhere to that opinion?—I apprehend that if we could apply the measures which I have just suggested, and if we had unlimited power to make such alterations as we might think necessary in different districts, we might ultimately succeed in getting rid of the disease.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

654. I dare say that you will remember, that before the last Committee there were some witnesses who stated that they thought that stopping the movement of cattle for six weeks would enable foot and mouth disease to be stamped out of the island?—I remember the statement.

655. You are not of opinion that that time would be anything like enough?—Certainly not; if we could do it in six years, I should think the work would be very well done.

656. Did you hear the evidence of Count Danneskiold?—Only the latter part of it.

657. Did you hear his evidence with regard to their action as to foot and mouth disease?—I know what their action has been from the printed papers which they have forwarded.

658. They appear to have stamped it out, do they not?—For a great many years they have not had it to any extent.

659. His statement that when they had it in recent years it was only in 13 small farms, would lead you to suppose, would it not, that it would be quite easy to stamp out the disease, if you had merely that to deal with?—Perfectly so, because the same thing has been done in Australia, I believe, on two occasions.

660. On page 4 of the Report of the Committee of 1873, you will find these passages: "Some agriculturists have recommended very stringent measures, such as the stoppage of all fairs and markets, and of the movement of animals, except by license, as during the prevalence of the cattle plague. On the other hand, there has been evidence of much weight, both by agriculturists and by professional witnesses, tending to show that such enactments would meet with strong opposition, and would be difficult, if not impossible, to carry out. Your Committee have come to the conclusion that it is hopeless to attempt to extirpate, or even materially to check this disease, unless the above-mentioned stringent measures are strictly enforced; and they also believe that such enforcement would require a costly and numerous staff of inspectors, and amount of supervision by the central authority which would excite much local opposition, at any rate in Great Britain, and such an interference with the home trade in animals as would much affect prices, and would induce not only the consumer, but the producer, to consider the remedy to be worse than the disease." Do you agree with that last paragraph, or not?—I quite agree with it.

661. I think I may understand, from your stating, that you agree with it, combined with your previous answers, that if you were asked, as a veterinary doctor, or as an officer of the veterinary department, how, supposing that full power was given to that department, the disease could be stamped out, you think that it possibly might be stamped out, but that you are of opinion from your knowledge of English farmers, and of English feeling, that the difficulties of using that power would make it almost impossible to do it?—That is my conviction, even from the experience that we have had since we took the cattle plague into our own hands. I found it necessary to arrange for an order to be passed to shut up Middlesex and the Metropolis, and to slaughter in the Metropolitan Market for the space of one month. I asked the Lord President to do it, and

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

and without any hesitation, he did it. I believe it was a sternly necessary measure. We have created an immense disturbance, and we have brought down upon us already two deputations threatening the population of London with starvation, all the drovers with ruin, and the very prompt closing of the Metropolitan Market as an institution.

662. I suppose the manner in which public opinion would view any step with regard to cattle plague would be entirely different from the manner in which it would view measures for stamping out foot and mouth disease?—Undoubtedly widely different.

663. From your experience, do you imagine that it would be possible to carry out in England these regulations, which you say would be necessary before you could stop the foreign import on account of foot and mouth disease?—I do not; but I also contend that nothing short of these regulations would be worth trying.

664. Therefore I understand you to say that it is vain to hope to get rid of foot and mouth disease by merely stopping the foreign import?—Quite so.

665. And that it would be ridiculous to stop that import, until you put in force regulations with regard to the home trade, which you do not believe would be submitted to?—Quite so, that is my view.

666. Now with regard to pleuro-pneumonia, it is much more difficult, is it not, to stamp that out?—It is more difficult on account of the difficulty of detecting the disease in its earliest stages.

667. If it were necessary to stop the movement of animals for a week on account of foot and mouth disease, it would be necessary to stop it for a month or six weeks on account of pleuro-pneumonia, would it not?—Yes, or for a longer period still; I should take two months.

668. Therefore, although the inducement to stamp out the disease would be greater because it is so much more destructive, the inconvenience from the attempt would also be much greater?—It is alleged that the damage done by foot and mouth disease is much greater than the damage done by pleuro-pneumonia.

669. Then, as regards pleuro-pneumonia, you would not suggest these regulations as being upon the whole desirable?—My chief objection to the scheme, which I myself propose, would be that it would excite so much opposition that it would be impossible to carry it into effect.

670. You, with your great knowledge of the subject, having been asked how the thing could be stopped, your suggestions merely mean this: "If I had despotic power given to me and could ride over the feeling of the country, or the inconvenience that is felt by farmers, I could do it in this way?"—That is my idea.

671. We now come to your recommendations with regard to cattle plague; you did not make these recommendations to the previous Committee, did you?—I did not.

672. Has there been any other fact, except this last outbreak of cattle plague, that has induced you to make them?—No, the last outbreak of cattle plague quite convinced me that even with the system that we have adopted at Deptford, where we believe that we have everything far more complete than we have at any other port, the arrangements were not sufficient

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

to prevent the introduction of the disease into the country.

673. I understand you to mean that they are not sufficient absolutely to secure you against the possibility of the disease being imported?—They are not even sufficient to give us a reasonable security, because every time cattle plague has approached the coast it has got into the interior.

674. You are going to give us a return of the loss in 1872; what do you imagine the loss has been this time?—The actual money loss, I should say, would be something like 10,000 *l.* or 12,000 *l.*

675. Do you, or do you not, think that it is reasonable to expect that you would be able to stamp out cattle plague if it were to come in again, as quickly as you did in 1872, and as you hope to have done this time?—Presuming that we obtained as early information of the outbreak as we did on this occasion, I have no doubt that we could stamp it out much more quickly.

676. Your faith in the power to stamp out cattle plague has not diminished?—Not at all.

677. Then does not that fact cast some doubt in your mind upon the necessity for such a very great change in the trade as you suggest, to stop the possibility of cattle plague coming in?—I base these recommendations upon the broad principle that so much alarm is caused in the country by the appearance of the disease, and so many oppressive restrictions are made in quarters where there is not the slightest necessity for them, and so much injury is caused to trade generally by the mere suspicion of the outbreak, that it would be almost worth any cost to make ourselves perfectly free for the future.

678. Have you not also felt that it was your business to tell the chiefs of the veterinary department how we could be secured against all danger of cattle plague?—Certainly; I felt that a part of my duty.

679. And therefore it was much more your business to state that than it was to enter into the possible loss that might follow from those measures being taken?—Quite so.

680. With regard to the import of live cattle into Great Britain, and especially into London, in the first place, what do you now think is the proportion that the import of cattle bears to the consumption of cattle for the whole island?—I am sorry to say that I have great distrust of all the calculations which have been made; I quite fail to see on what fair basis any calculation can be made at all. The statement which is generally accepted is that the total amount does not exceed 5 per cent. The calculation which was made in the Veterinary Department, places it at from 10 to 14 per cent.

681. At Question 347, in the evidence which was given before the former Committee in 1873, Dr. Williams said that he thought that in the year 1870 the home supply was about 60¼ per cent. of our live cattle; that the Irish supply was 27½ per cent., and the foreign supply 12¼ per cent.; have you made any estimate with regard to that calculation?—At the time that it was made, I quite failed to follow Dr. Williams in his calculation, and I have repeatedly since endeavoured to substantiate it or to disprove it, and, from the figures given, I have failed to arrive at any conclusion whatever.

682. Therefore it may be, so far as you know,

Professor *Brown.*

15 May 1877.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

5 per cent., or it may be 15 per cent.?—Yes, and I believe so far as everybody else knows.

683. With regard to the metropolis we know more about it?—We know, certainly, that something like 45 per cent. comes into the metropolitan market.

684. It was a very little less last year than it was the year before, I think?—There was a very slight difference.

685. How far do you think that the dead meat would affect the calculation?—I do not apprehend that the dead meat would much affect the quantity of live stock, because that depends so entirely upon another set of traders. The prices have more to do with the quantity than any other circumstance.

686. Supposing that the suggestion which has been made by some gentleman was carried out, that all importation of live stock into the country, and, therefore, into the metropolis, should be stopped, do you not imagine that that would very considerably affect prices in the metropolis?—There cannot be a doubt that it would be made a reason for sending the prices up at once.

687. Quite independently of the beliefs and anticipations, there would be such a diminution of the supply that it must send the prices up?—Unquestionably it must.

688. Would you think that your position, as connected with the Veterinary Department, would be a very pleasant one a few weeks after that Order was issued?—I am satisfied that it is anything but a pleasant one, even under the three Orders which are at present in operation, particularly in the case of the one shutting up Middlesex and the metropolis, and the Metropolitan Market. I rather doubt if it would be safe for me to be in the Metropolitan Market after dark under the present circumstances.

689. But can you give any idea to the Committee as to what would be the probable effect upon the supply of food in London of stopping the import of all live stock?—If it were done immediately, I have no doubt that the result would be that we should fail to receive the greater portion of those supplies.

690. And, so far as you can calculate, that is very nearly half the supply of cattle that were killed in London last year?—Of the cattle that were sent to the Metropolitan Market. Of course a certain number of them are taken out again to large towns.

691. But that would rather make the proportion of the foreign animals greater, would it not?—Both foreign and English are taken out.

692. As none of the Deptford cattle can be taken out, it would rather make it greater, would it not?—It would.

693. When did you first begin to hear of the American import of dead meat?—In the autumn of last year.

694. Would you think that we really know much about that import until we have had it tried by a summer?—So far as I can judge from the evidence that has been published, there is nothing definite on the subject. It seems to be a question whether the whole thing is a speculation or not, and whether or not we shall be able to move meat from the landing places in the very hottest weather, without considerably damaging its quality.

695. I see that in your previous evidence you stated that dead meat was imported into New York very much; you are aware, I suppose, that the heat in New York is much greater than it is in London in the summer?—Yes.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

696. Do you know whether the dead meat import went on during the hot months in New York?—I am not aware.

697. Is the dead meat trade increasing between Aberdeen and London?—I am not aware of its increase to any great extent.

698. Do you know whether dead meat comes in with the help of ice from any place, except from the States?—I believe not. I am told by the butchers that beef from Scotland is not brought in any quantities during the hottest weather.

699. Now with regard to your recommendation as to the cattle plague; I understand you to say that you would stop all import of live cattle from Germany and from Belgium, excepting from Schleswig and Holstein, why would you exclude Schleswig and Holstein?—I propose to put Schleswig and Holstein in the schedule, so that the small risk of introduction of cattle plague into that country should be met by slaughter at the ports until we hear that it has got into the country.

700. How would you prevent the other German cattle getting through Schleswig?—I propose that Schleswig should deal with it as it does now, and give us the same guarantees not to import from other countries.

701. I suppose you are aware that those are guarantees for which we must really look to a foreign government, but which we have no right of enforcing, and that the temptation would be very much stronger if there was no import at all allowed?—Undoubtedly.

702. Besides, has not the cattle plague got into Schleswig?—I believe that on each occasion it has reached Hamburg.

703. I suppose, if you stop the import at all from Germany, you would be more anxious to stop it from Hamburg than from anywhere else?—Certainly.

704. How far is Hamburg from Schleswig?——The Hamburg market is partly in the Holstein district.

705. Would it not be difficult to maintain a prohibition with regard to Hamburg which did not apply to Schleswig and Holstein?—It would be difficult, but I think that it might be done; and, in the absence of guarantees, I think we should be compelled to prohibit the importation from Holstein also.

706. Supposing that we had to prohibit it from Schleswig and Holstein as well, how many cattle were imported from Germany altogether last year?—About 69,000, including Schleswig and Holstein.

707. How many were imported to the port of London?—The number of cattle imported from Germany into the port of London was 55,328.

708. In that year there were imported into London altogether 147,000 cattle, I think?—Yes, there were.

709. Consequently, if you had to stop the whole of the German import, including Schleswig, you would strike off at once one-third of the foreign import?—We should.

710. That means about 15 per cent. of the total consumption of cattle in London, does it not?—Yes.

711. Would you let the sheep alone?—Dealing

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

ing with cattle plague exclusively, I should propose to land the sheep only for slaughter, as we are doing now.

712. But I understand you to say that at the present time, or at least during this late outbreak, a great many sheep were affected?—In the district of Emden chiefly.

713. How would you be able to justify a measure which let in the sheep while you excluded the cattle?—I should justify it on the principle that we have not had the cattle plague introduced into this country by foreign sheep, and, so far as I am aware, no sheep affected with the disease have been landed in this country, so that I should meet the slight risk by slaughtering them at the port of landing.

714. But I understood you to say that you were so very fearful of risk that you would even stop the import of dead meat when the cattle plague existed?—I should stop the import of sheep and goats, and also meat and other products of animals, when I knew the cattle plague to exist.

715. What are the present regulations in the office for obtaining information as to cattle plague getting into Germany?—By the international arrangements, we agree to telegraph to certain foreign countries, including Germany, any outbreak of cattle plague in this country, and they on their part agree to telegraph to us as soon as they obtain information.

716. You have every reason, have you not, to suppose that during the last year there was no cattle plague in Germany?—We believe not.

717. Or in 1875?—Two outbreaks were reported in 1875.

718. Or in 1874?—As to 1874, I am not quite certain; I believe there was no outbreak in 1874.

719. With that information which you obtain, which is now under very much better organisation in consequence of the international arrangement, does it not strike you that it would be rather unreasonable to stop this large import into London in years when there was no cattle plague whatever in Germany?—Excepting that in each case when cattle plague has broken out in Germany the information has reached us too late to make it available.

720. Not too late for you to take the restrictive measures?—Not too late for us to take restrictive measures when it was in this country.

721. I suppose you would admit that, both in 1872 and this year, the fact of your getting the information immensely diminished the danger that otherwise would have occurred?—Yes; but on this occasion we got the information from the newspapers.

722. How many sheep were imported into London from Germany in 1876?—Two hundred and thirty-eight thousand three hundred and eighty-three.

723. Supposing, then, that there was the same progress with regard to the necessity of restrictions as you have yourself made between 1873 and the present time, and that the recommendation was then also to stop the sheep, that would have a very great effect, would it not?—We should not stop the sheep for cattle plague, as we have not done it on this occasion; but we should simply place them in such a position that they could only be landed for slaughtering; and we find that under that restriction the number during this year has been enormously increased.

724. I am going upon the supposition that it

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

being found that cattle plague could be carried by sheep, and was conveyed to sheep, the restrictions would have to apply to sheep; then it would have a very considerable effect, would it not?—Undoubtedly.

725. With regard to Deptford, does a larger or a smaller proportion of the live cattle imported come into Deptford now than was the case two or three years ago?—I am not at this moment prepared with the figures; but I believe that during the last few months we have had a considerable number of cattle there, in consequence of Holland being scheduled.

726. It sometimes used to be stated, that although a good many of the importers thought it a very hard thing to be compelled to send their cattle to Deptford, yet that they were prepared to admit that the fluctuations and changes (the Privy Council Office having sometimes suddenly to order them to be sent there) were disadvantageous, and that it might be better to force all the cattle that came to London to go to Deptford; have you any opinion upon that matter?—I believe that it would be advantageous, in a sanitary point of view, either to send them all to Deptford, or to establish arrangements for slaughtering at Thames Haven.

727. Supposing that your proposals for restrictions as to pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease were carried out, you say that you would stop the breeding stock coming in from Holland?—Unless under certain restrictions, such as certificate of origin, and supervision subsequently.

728. You stated that you did not think it was wanted; why did you give that opinion?—My opinion is that store-stock is not wanted from the Continent, but I made an exception in favour of dairy-stock from Holland.

729. It finds a market here, does it not?—I believe very few store cattle are purchased.

730. Then they do not come over to any extent?—Only for dairy purposes.

731. But the 10,000 would not come unless they were wanted, would they?—I have no doubt that there is a good market for them, but I should allow those 10,000 to come, presuming that they came from healthy districts, and that I was allowed to keep them under observation for three months after they have got here.

732. With regard to fat stock from Spain and Portugal, I understand you to say that you would have different regulations from those existing at present?—I should deal with them in the same way that I should propose to deal with animals in this country.

733. Would you do the same with Denmark?—I should.

734. Do you doubt the evidence that has been given to us, that the animals that come from Denmark are exceptionally healthy?—Not at all, but we have had even recently foot-and-mouth disease introduced along with Danish animals; and I should, on that ground, if I propose to stop foot-and-mouth disease, deal with them as I should with animals from Spain, where foot-and-mouth disease only prevails occasionally.

735. With regard to foot-and-mouth disease being introduced from Denmark, do you recollect when it was introduced?—About the last day of February this year there was a cargo, among which there were seven animals affected with the disease.

736. What is the present Order in force with

Professor *Brown.*

15 May 1877.

Professor *Brown.*

15 May 1877.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

regard to foot-and-mouth disease; if one beast is found with it in a cargo, are all the rest of the cargo slaughtered or not?—All the cargo, cattle, sheep, and swine, are slaughtered.

737. That is a restriction of a severity entirely beyond that which applies to home cattle, is it not?—Certainly.

738. Or to Irish cattle?—Or to Irish cattle.

739. In the case of a cargo that comes from Denmark, or from Hamburg, having one animal with foot-and-mouth disease, all the rest of the beasts are slaughtered?—Yes, and the sheep and the swine as well.

740. In the case of a cargo that comes from Ireland, in which there may be 500 animals, and 200 have got the disease, what becomes of the other 300?—They would be sent about as if they had nothing the matter with them.

741. In the case of a drove going into the Islington Market, if half of them are found to have foot-and-mouth disease, what becomes of the others?—The others would be sold and taken away, just as if they were perfectly healthy.

742. Therefore, as far as regards any infectious animal that comes from abroad, the present regulation is far stronger to prevent the infection being spread than it is as regards any animal that comes either from Ireland, or from the provinces, into London?—Decidedly.

Mr. *Wilbraham Egerton.*

743. You have spoken of international engagements; can you tell us what progress has been made since the report of 1875, in which you state that "It is now hoped that arrangements of a similar nature" (to those which had been adopted at the Vienna Conference) "will be soon completed with most of the other countries represented at that conference"?—We have completed arrangements with Austria and Italy, and also with Germany and Russia; I am not aware that there are any other countries with which arrangements have been completed.

744. Have you any arrangement with Holland?—We have arrangements with Holland chiefly relating to the importation into that country; they agreed to prohibit the entrance of stock from other countries, so long as we allowed them to remain out of the schedule.

745. That is an international agreement?—Yes.

746. At the present time they are allowing sheep to come through Holland into this country for slaughter, are they not, with the knowledge, as I understand, of the Privy Council?—No, we have no power to prevent it. As we put them in the schedule, they said, "We may as well now let animals go through our country;" and the only answer they got was, "You must do as you think best."

747. It is very important that we should draw, if possible, supplies of live animals from Holland, is it not?—For dairy purposes.

748. And also for meat, is it not?—I propose to get the meat by slaughtering the fat stock at the port of landing in this country.

749. As far as cattle plague is concerned, the arrangements that are now made in Holland are such as would keep out all animals coming from countries south and east of it, are they not?—They are, when the arrangements are in full action; that is to say, when Holland is out of the schedule.

Mr. *Wilbraham Egerton*—continued.

750. Therefore you would propose to put Holland into the schedule, in consequence of its danger from pleuro-pneumonia, rather than of its danger from cattle plague?—Yes, solely on that account.

751. Do any sheep come from Russia now?—Very rarely.

752. Still they are allowed, are they not?—If they do not come with cattle, and are landed in defined parts of the ports.

753. Will you state what difference there has been since the Committee of 1873 with regard to the ports which have scheduled and unscheduled cattle together in the same or contiguous markets?—Since the report of 1873, several ports have been struck out altogether; that is to say, Bristol, Cardiff, Dartmouth, Dover, Folkestone, Grangemouth, Littlehampton, Penzance, South Shields, and Shoreham.

754. Is that since the report of 1876?—Some of them have been struck out since the report of 1876, and some of them before.

755. From the report of 1876 I see that there are 30 ports in which foreign animals might be landed, and in only 13 out of those are there parts defined for the landing and slaughter of cattle from scheduled countries; is that so?—That number has been since reduced.

756. How many are there in the latter category?—We have struck out the defined part at Glasgow, the defined part at Littlehampton, and the defined part at North Shields and Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

757. Do you think it is desirable that there should exist any port where the scheduled and unscheduled cattle should be placed together in the same or contiguous market?—Supposing that the scheduled countries remain as they were before the last outbreak of cattle plague, it appears to be desirable not to allow animals from the two sets of countries to be landed in the same port, unless the landing places are kept quite distinct.

758. Has that recommendation in the report of 1873 been thoroughly or particularly carried out in which it says, "That the Privy Council, in exercising the power conferred upon them by Part III. of the English Act, should limit the ports at which foreign animals are allowed to be landed to those at which satisfactory provisions have been made for their lairage, isolation, and slaughter, and for the disposal of their carcases"?—It has been carried out to a considerable extent.

759. To the extent that you have just mentioned?—To the extent I have just mentioned.

760. Do you think that it ought to be carried still further?—The recommendation is, I may say, still being carried out; we are still in correspondence with the authorities at the ports where the regulations are not what we require.

761. When you say that it is undesirable that animals from scheduled and unscheduled countries should be herded together in the same market, are you speaking generally or with regard to any particular cases?—I am speaking with reference to cases which have come under my notice, where it would have been almost impossible to prevent the animals being mixed together after landing, except by such precautions as could be taken by persons, there being no effectual barrier between the two landing-places, one for

Mr. *Wilbraham Egerton*—continued.

for the scheduled and the other for the unscheduled animals.

762. I understand you to say that, supposing your extreme regulations could not be carried out, you think that still further stringency in the regulations with regard to ports should be adopted, in order to prevent the risk of animals coming from scheduled countries and unscheduled countries being placed together?—I do.

763. Do you think that the cattle plague, immediately it breaks out, should be treated by the Privy Council in the same way as it is now?—Certainly, if it is desired to get rid of it without loss of time, and at the least possible expense.

764. I understand you to advocate uniformity of action by means of Government inspection; is it not so?—It is.

765. Is that under the present system or under your extreme system?—My own idea is that unless we adopt an extreme system in reference to the foot-and-mouth disease we might just as well leave the whole affair alone.

766. Were you speaking in reference to foot-and-mouth disease, or in reference to diseases in animals generally, when you were speaking of Government inspectors all over the country?—I was speaking in reference mainly to foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia.

767. Would you propose in each county to have a chief inspector?—Some such arrangement as that must be necessary; some one must be there to be in constant communication with the office, and to take his instructions from us.

768. As the matter stands at present, in many countries the chief inspector is appointed by the quarter sessions, and he is governed by a committee appointed by the quarter sessions; do you propose entirely to supersede that officer, and to vest the power which he possesses in a Government officer with instructions from the central office in London?—I should do so, and I should take care that that officer was a person competent to advise npon the sanitary question, which the chief inspector is not now usually competent to advise about, because it is usually the chief constable, or some gentleman in that position, who is not presumed to have any professional knowledge.

769. I understood you to say that you thought the cost of this arrangement would not be very much greater than the cost of the present one, as at present the inspectors are paid by the local authority; but you propose that these inspectors should still be paid by the local authority?—I should presume so. I apprehend that the Treasury would not undertake the payment of 2,000 inspectors in the country.

770. Do you think that the local authority would submit to have to pay inspectors who were entirely Government officers, who were not at all under their control, instead of, as at present, having officers entirely under their control, who are paid for by the country?—I think it is quite likely that there would be a difficulty upon that score.

771. Then do I correctly understand you to say that that is merely your suggestion, as what you think the best thing to be done?—Quite so.

772. You do not say whether such a course will be acceptable to the country generally?—No; dealing with the question of cattle plague in the way that I should deal with it, I am afraid that I should act very much like a general I

Mr. *Wilbraham Egerton*—continued.

lately read of, who was told that his proceedings in stamping out something objectionable would cause a revolution, and he said he should stamp out the revolution also. I have mentioned to the Committee before that in all financial matters I do not presume to have any opinion whatever; I simply order the thing to be done, and leave somebody else to pay for it.

773. As you say that you believe that the farmers are not prepared to submit to such restrictions as you propose, is your proposal really a serious proposal, or is it only an alternative proposal?—So far as I can understand my own feelings in the matter, it is purely an alternative proposal.

774. I want to ask you not what you think ought to be done, but what you think can be done; if your extreme proposal cannot be carried out, what is the proposal which you think can be carried out, with your knowledge of the country, and of the prejudices, perhaps, that farmers may have against any such interference as you propose? First of all, with regard to the cattle plague, do you think that the measures that you would require to prevent the introduction of cattle plague into this country would also, to a certain extent, be sufficient to prevent the introduction of a great many other diseases which are now complained of, and, therefore, could you treat the question simply as a question of keeping out cattle plague?—I think that the means of keeping out cattle plague would not very considerably influence the introduction of other diseases, because, in reference to foot-and-mouth disease, the present restrictions are of such a nature as to prevent the escape of infected animals generally; it is only occasionally that we get the disease into the country in that way. In reference to pleuro-pneumonia, we very rarely get it from Germany, the country whence we get cattle plague; and, therefore, on that score I do not apprehend that cattle-plague restrictions would materially influence either of the other diseases.

775. I understand your view to be rather contrary to the opinion of many agriculturists, that these diseases are not introduced by foreign animals into England except occasionally, and that the foreign animals form no material element in the spread of the two diseases, pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease, as is imagined generally?—That is my conviction.

776. With regard to cattle plague, supposing that you took measures to slaughter all animals either at the port of embarkation or at the port of debarkation, as you do now in the case of cattle from scheduled countries, that would give an immunity from cattle plague?—Slaughtering at the port of embarkation would, but not slaughtering at the port of debarkation, without some other arrangements which would give us power to prevent the conveyance of the disease by mediate contagion.

777. What has been the effect of the present Orders upon the price of meat since the outbreak of cattle plague?—I should not think that the Orders that have been issued in the last three months have had any effect upon the price of meat.

778. In the previous Committee, I think it was stated that the slaughter at British ports had rather lowered the price?—That was in 1865 and 1866. It was found on inquiry, which was made

Professor *Brown.*

15 May 1877.

Mr. *Wilbraham Egerton*—continued.

in Manchester and other large towns, that during the operation of the restrictive Orders the price of meat had fallen, but no connection whatever was traced between the price of meat and the Orders; the two facts were merely taken together.

779. Can you tell us whether there has been any diminution in the quantity of meat which has been brought into the port of London from the Continent?—Yes, the supply at the Metropolitan Market has fallen off very considerably.

780. In the foreign supply?—The supply from Holland, chiefly; in consequence of putting Holland in the schedule, it was not possible to send Dutch animals to the Metropolitan Market.

781. Has the supply from Germany fallen off?—We totally prohibited the introduction of live animals from Germany.

782. You say that it has fallen off in consequence of the Dutch animals not being allowed?—The supply to the Metropolitan Market has fallen off in consequence of the Dutch animals not being allowed.

783. But they go to Deptford?—They do.

784. Therefore you are merely speaking of the supply to the Metropolitan Market, and not of the supply to London?—No, the supply to London has not fallen off seriously, except so far as regards the German cattle.

785. With regard to foot-and-mouth disease, you do not approve of any restrictions being carried out, such as have been carried out for the last few years, since the Order of the Privy Council of 1874 was renewed?—I do not find that any particular benefit arises. I am able to prophecy when a new accession of disease will occur, and to be right within a week, without reference to the Orders, and without regard to the importation of foreign cattle.

786. From time to time the foot-and-mouth disease has disappeared altogether from this country, has it not?—Not since it was introduced in 1839.

787. It has disappeared in certain parts of the country, has it not?—Yes, in certain parts of the country it has disappeared.

788. When the disease first breaks out again in any one spot, do you not think that it is advisable to limit the movement of cattle in that district?—Yes, that is the essence of the scheme which I propose.

789. That is now done by the power conferred upon the local authority formerly, and re-conferred upon them by the Order of 1874?—It is done to a very slight extent in some few districts.

790. But you are not aware that it has been unsuccessful where it has been tried?—In those few districts where it has been tried it has been successful.

791. But there have been no general Orders; it has only been partially adopted, has it?—That is so.

792. With regard to quarantine, there is an opinion that quarantine should be largely adopted for animals coming from abroad where they are not slaughtered; do you think that that could be carried out in any of our large ports?—It seems that the difficulty of establishing sufficiently extensive arrangements, and the enormous loss of property that would result when contagious disease breaks out, offer an insurmountable objection to the system altogether.

793. Evidence was given before the Trade in

Mr. *Wilbraham Egerton*—continued.

Animals Committee to the effect that in large towns like Liverpool and London, and perhaps Hull, it would be almost impossible to have proper grounds for quarantining, and that if you had them they would be only hotbeds of disease; do you agree with that opinion?—I quite agree with that idea. It seems to me impossible to establish a system of any extent which should allow you to keep cargoes sufficiently separate to make it safe to let one cargo escape while disease existed in another part of the quarantine station.

794. It was also argued before that Committee, that the objections to quarantine were, first of all, the expense; secondly, the interference with trade; and, thirdly, the deterioration of the animals during quarantine; you think that all those are objections to quarantine?—I think so.

795. Quarantine has been tried in small cases like Southampton with success, and probably it can be only tried in small cases with success?—That is my apprehension. It answers perfectly well so long as no disease breaks out, and no disease has ever happened among animals quarantined at Southampton.

796. Do you think that it would be possible to introduce dairy animals from Holland at the port of Harwich, say, with such precautions as would prevent the introduction of pleuro-pneumonia into England from those animals?—I believe the only feasible system would be the one which I suggested, viz., to get the animals from districts where no pleuro-pneumonia exists, and that could be done in Holland very easily. The state of the country is very well known to the officials. The cattle might be landed at Harwich, driven to the premises of the persons who purchased them, and kept under observation there. In that way we should have a series of quarantine stations, of which the owners of the animals themselves would be the proprietors.

797. Do you think that the farmers themselves might do much to prevent the spread of disease if they would use the ordinary precautions of quarantining their own animals after they bought them, by isolation from the rest of the herd?—Undoubtedly they might do a great deal, but as a rule it seems to me that stockowners exercise their ingenuity in every way to see how they can get disease. The London dairymen have been doing that for the last three months.

Mr. *Torr.*

798. There seems to have been some difference of opinion between the Department and your inspectors as to the nature of some of the later cases of cattle disease that have occurred in the metropolitan district; will you give the date of the last case in London, as to which you consider there is no doubt of its having been cattle plague?—The case which occurred on 1st May has certain circumstances connected with it which make it doubtful; and the outbreak in Hull on 5th May is another instance where the surrounding circumstances lead to a conclusion different from that which would be drawn from the symptoms and post-mortem appearances of the animals.

799. But I want to get the latest date at which a case occurred, as to which there is no doubt, and as to which both the Department and the inspectors are fully of one opinion that it was really

Mr. *Torr*—continued.

really a case of cattle plague?—The last case as to which I have no doubt at all, was the one which occurred in Notting Hill on the 25th of April.

800. In all the cases that have occurred since that date in the metropolitan district, there is some doubt as to whether they were really cases of cattle plague or not?—There has been only one case since, on 1st May, and that has been very generally doubted; in fact I read an article this morning in one of the papers throwing considerable doubt upon the matter.

801. What do you consider to be the last case in Hull as to which there is no doubt?—In reference to the last case, near the Paragon Station, on the 22nd of March, I have no evidence at all; therefore I have a right to take that as a case about which there is no doubt; it has not been questioned that I am aware of. I should say that 22nd of March is the date of the last case in Hull, about which there is no doubt.

802. With regard to these 2,000 inspectors, is it part of your scheme that they should all be appointed by the Department in London, and that they should all be in communication with the Department in London?—I should not absolutely insist on their appointment by the Department, but the Department should have a right to object to the appointment of any inspector who was not considered to be competent; I think that the appointment should either be made or confirmed by the Department, and certainly in the case of all the head inspectors, they should be in communication with the central authority.

Mr. *Assheton*.

803. I wish to ask you what has led you to modify your opinion as to the contagious nature of foot-and-mouth disease so very much since you gave your evidence in 1873?—I do not think that I have altered my opinion at all.

804. The two opinions seem so very different, that either I have made a mistake or you have made a mistake. In the evidence before the Committee of 1873, at Question 2524 you were asked, "But with regard to the foot-and-mouth disease, I believe that is very easily transmitted without the contact of animals;" and your answer is: "Undoubtedly; by the mere conveyance of a small quantity of the saliva." Then the next question is: "If you were to take a lock of hay out of the mouth of a diseased bullock, do you think it would be possible to go 200 miles and infect another bullock with it?" and your answer is: "I should think very possibly indeed. I have done it at a shorter distance;" then the next question is: "Have you successfully done it?" and your answer is, "Successfully;" since that time you seem to have altered your opinion a good deal; at Question 44 in your examination on Friday, you were asked this: "You mean that the evidence does not show that foot-and-mouth disease is contagious in that way?" and you reply, "It does not show that it is conveyed by mediate contagion in the same way as cattle plague is;" then in answer to Question 46 you wind up by saying: "So that while I admit that foot-and-mouth disease may be conveyed by mediate contagion, I contend that the risk, as compared with cattle plague, is exceedingly slight"?—Yes, that is my impression; indeed, I may say that that is the fact in reference to the conveyance of

Mr. *Assheton*—continued.

foot-and-mouth disease by mediate contagion, but it is not so readily conveyed as cattle plague is.

805. So that in that respect you have altered your opinion from what it was in 1873?—No, what I stated in 1873 was a fact; that if you take hay from the mouth of a diseased animal and transmit it to the mouth of a healthy one, as a rule, you give the disease. I have not done it since, but I have no doubt that I could do it to-morrow with the greatest certainty; it has been done hundreds of times. But my meaning is that while the landing of cattle-plague animals in this country is almost certain to be followed by the transmission of disease by mediate contagion, foot-and-mouth disease is not so readily conveyed.

806. Holding that view, I do not quite see how you can account for the very rapid spread of foot-and-mouth disease?—Chiefly by the movement of diseased and infected animals dropping their saliva about the roads and on the pastures.

807. You admit the mediate contagion then?—Yes, I assert it. The only doubt that has ever been thrown upon the matter was in the experiments of Mr. Duguid, who certainly failed for some months to produce it by the saliva and other products of diseased animals taken from foreign beasts at Deptford; but as soon as it broke out in the Metropolitan Market, and he got some of the English virus, he did it with the greatest ease. I cannot explain it, I merely state the fact.

808. Are you aware that the popular opinion amongst farmers is that it is an exceedingly catching disease?—It is one of the most highly contagious diseases which exist amongst animals; I should say that it stands second only to cattle plague.

Mr. *James Corry*.

809. Am I correct in assuming that your evidence to the Committee amounts to this: that you have a plan which you believe in time would stamp out the various diseases which affect cattle; but that you do not think that the country would submit to it?—That is my impression.

Mr. *Jacob Bright*.

810. You have spoken a good deal about your power to stamp out cattle diseases, in case Parliament were to give you the power; you have asserted that it is possible to do it?—I believe it is.

811. When you speak of stamping out cattle diseases, do you mean that they would be stamped out for ever, or would you have to go on stamping them out?—Judging from the history of these diseases, it would be very difficult to prevent their re-introduction occasionally; but in such circumstances we should of course stamp them out much more readily.

812. When you speak of their re-introduction, do you mean their introduction from abroad, or their originating here or anywhere?—I mean re-introduction from abroad.

813. Do you assume that it is impossible that they could originate here?—So far as one can judge from the evidence, there is no such possibility existing.

814. Do you consider that the diseases existed in this country before they were brought by imported cattle?—That has never been explained clearly, but the probability is that the foot-and-mouth disease was introduced by surplus ships' stores which were commonly brought to this

Professor *Brown.*

15 May 1877.

Mr. *Jacob Bright*—continued.

country; and it is asserted that pleuro-pneumonia was introduced into the neighbourhood of Cork by cows that were brought from Holland, and smuggled in.

815. Are there not in this country, with regard to animals as with regard to men, many conditions which are unfavourable to health?—Undoubtedly.

816. Would those conditions which are unfavourable to health in this country ever breed disease if you had a wall round the whole island?—None of the diseases which are developed spontaneously in this country ever spread to any extent through the medium of contagion.

817. You admitted that in 1839 and 1840 we had foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia in this country?—We had.

818. Is it not also admitted that we had cattle plague itself many years ago?—There is no doubt that we had a very fatal disease resembling cattle plague in the latter part of the last century.

819. Is it a mere assumption to say that these diseases came from abroad; can anybody prove that they did not arise in this country?—It is possibly not capable of absolute demonstration, but there is the fact that these diseases always had a prior existence on the Continent before they reached us, and that, so far as we can ascertain, none of them have ever been developed in this country unless they had been so introduced.

820. With regard to foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia, I understand you to say that unless the restrictions are equal with regard to cattle coming from Ireland, with regard to cattle moving about in this country, and with regard to cattle being imported from abroad, it is folly to suppose that we shall do much in the way of diminishing disease?—I think the experience of the last 10 years proves that we do little or nothing. I have no faith at all unless some such severe system as I suggest is adopted.

821. On the other hand, you do not believe that you will ever see that severe system adopted?—I do not.

822. That being the case, would you very much lessen the restrictions which now exist with regard to the importation of animals?—No, I should make it as certain as possible that we had no more cattle plague. So far as pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease are concerned, I should merely schedule Holland until Holland was quite free, and I should detain animals from unscheduled countries for 24 hours at the landing place instead of 12 hours.

823. Why would you have more restrictions with regard to foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia or cattle coming from abroad, than on cattle coming from Ireland?—I do not apprehend that we could possibly deal with Ireland otherwise than as part of the United Kingdom.

824. Then why would you have more restrictions upon cattle coming from abroad than on cattle moving in this country, if you say that it is useless?—So far as stamping out the disease is concerned it is useless. We should diminish it to the extent of every case that we slaughtered at the landing place, and the longer we detain the animals the greater chance we have of detecting the disease.

825. You think then that it is a right thing if one cow gets foot-and-mouth disease coming across the Channel to kill every one of the cattle on board, and all the sheep and all the goats, and, in fact, all the animals?—On the principle that if we let them go we certainly introduce large numbers of fresh centres of infection, because the majority of those animals will have the disease in the course of the next week or 10 days.

826. At the same time in the very country in which they are landed the cattle are moving about without any restrictions whatever?—Yes, that is an inconsistency which is apparent.

827. Is it not ten years since we had the cattle plague?—The last outbreak occurred in 1872.

828. Then we had it in 1867, had we not?—We had it from 1865 to 1867.

829. Then after 1867, when did it occur again?—We had no further outbreak until 1872.

830. Then for five years we had been free?—We had.

831. And we have the cattle plague now, and it has cost us 10,000 *l.*?—I may have to alter the figures considerably, but I judge at this moment, speaking roughly, that it has cost us from 10,000 *l.* to 12,000 *l.*

832. Does not that show that your present system of restrictions, and your means of interfering with this cattle plague, are very considerable and successful?—It does.

833. If you have only lost 10,000 *l.* in five years it is just possible that you may go another five years and not lose more than 10,000 *l.*, is it not?—I think it is quite probable, but at the same time the loss does not include the immense amount of damage done to the trade of the country from the alarm which is occasioned, and from the very oppressive restrictions which have to be enforced.

834. Still from the fact that you may every few years have an attack of this kind, which you admit that you are generally able to deal with, you would shut out the cattle of German altogether?—For the purpose of restoring the confidence which certainly is now lost all over the country.

835. You would not admit the cattle of Germany even to be slaughtered at the place of landing?—No, because that system has entirely failed.

836. Still you say that they are extremely strict in Germany in regard to their cattle; you said, did you not, that Germany had severer regulations than any that we have in this country, or than any that would be submitted to in this country?—Far more severe.

837. Then, might it not be expected that, generally, those restrictions would succeed?—Yes, but they have not succeeded in protecting us from cattle plague three times in 12 years.

838. There were several consecutive years when we had no disease from Germany, were there not?—No disease but foot-and-mouth disease; we have always had that.

839. Then, how would you propose to make it impossible to import any cattle from Germany?—I do not apprehend that the conditions will ever be materially changed; Germany will always be liable to incursions of cattle plague on her eastern frontier.

840. Then you look forward to shutting out the cattle of Germany for a very long period?—Yes, with the probable result that some proportion of the meat which we thereby lose would be sent to us in the form of dead meat.

841. Would you shut out the sheep of Germany?—I should allow the sheep to be landed for slaughter as we are doing now.

842. I understood

Mr. *Jacob Bright*—continued.

842. I understood you to say that sheep do not convey the cattle disease?—If they come in contact with diseased cattle they may convey it, and sometimes they take it; they take it readily by inoculation.

843. We have had a great many Merino sheep, I think, from Germany in the northern towns, have we not?—Yes.

844. It would be of some consequence, of course, that they should come, if possible?—Undoubtedly it is a matter of some consequence.

845. You recommend that cattle should be shut out, lest we may possibly have the cattle plague; but I understood you to say that dead meat would have to be shut out if it came from a country where there was any suspicion of cattle plague?—I should certainly prohibit the importation of dead meat from a country where I knew cattle plague to exist.

846. Should we have any advantage at all by changing from live cattle to dead meat if both are liable to be shut out in case there is cattle plague in the country?—The chief advantage would be that the risk during the time would be very materially diminished, as the danger of conveying the disease by dead meat is very much less than the danger of conveying it by means of live animals.

847. In what way is the danger less?—In the first place there is very little risk of the meat coming in contact with cattle.

848. But you tell us that the cattle get the disease from human beings moving about amongst them; therefore, if men were in contact with this meat, and were handling it every day, they might go and give the disease?—Yes; but the history of the disease proves that the risk is so slight that it would be hardly worth taking into account.

849. Still you will admit that those who have been trying to persuade the country to shut out cattle, and have only dead meat, will have a hard task in convincing the country now that it is admitted that we may have to shut out the meat as well?—Probably they will, so far as those countries are concerned in which cattle plague exists.

Sir *Rainald Knightley*.

850. I understand you to say that there is, comparatively speaking, very little danger of dead meat conveying the disease, as compared with movement amongst the cattle?—Very little indeed judging from all the facts which have transpired in the history of the disease.

851. Have you ever known any case in which cattle plague has broken out for the first time in the interior of England?—We have had no instance of an outbreak in the interior except from the movement of animals that have been landed on the coast.

852. Therefore, as far as it is possible to form a presumption, there is no indigenous cattle disease in England; but it is almost invariably imported from abroad?—Certainly, invariably.

853. I do not quite understand your proposal to exclude the cattle from Germany and to admit them from Schleswig-Holstein; is there any cattle plague in Schleswig-Holstein?—There is none now.

854. But Holstein and part of Schleswig is a part of Germany, is it not?—Both the provinces now belong to Germany, but they make strict regulations to prevent the crossing of German cattle, because they always apprehend the possibility of cattle plague being so introduced, and the larger part of their stock is drawn from Denmark.

Sir *Rainald Knightley*—continued.

855. Have they different regulations in Holstein from what they have in the rest of Germany?—Certainly.

856. Do you know what is the amount of cattle imported from Schleswig-Holstein to England?—Last year it was something like 50,000 head, I believe.

Mr. *Elliot*.

857. Can you tell the Committee what was the cost to the country of the last great outbreak of cattle plague in slaughtered meat and regulations, and one thing and another?—I am not aware that we have any good estimate of the actual cost, but I know that the losses amounted to something like one-third of a million of cattle that were actually destroyed in consequence of the disease.

Chairman.

858. Was that in 1865–7?—Yes.

Mr. *Elliot*.

859. How much would you put that at in money in round numbers?—I should hardly be able to give a reasonable idea at this moment; it has been estimated at several millions.

860. I have heard it estimated at something like 13,000,000 *l*.?—Something of that kind.

861. By your scheme you propose to stop the importation into Ireland, and by that means to try and put down pleuro-pneumonia, and foot-and-mouth disease?—Yes; because it is most important for this country that Ireland should be free from disease, as we obtain so large a quantity of our store stock from there.

Mr. *Ritchie*.

862. I understood you to say that if your idea of prohibiting the importation of live stock from Germany were carried out, the probability is that it would raise the price of meat?—I think there is no doubt at all that it would raise the price of meat.

863. And I understood you to give as your reason for advocating such a principle in years when no cattle plague existed, that it was so difficult to get information of the outbreak?—It is difficult to get information in time to enable us to stop the importation from Germany.

864. Is that your only reason for advocating that no live stock should be permitted to come from Germany during those years in which no cattle plague exists?—I think I may say that, so far as I can see at this moment, that is the only valid reason; because if we could always know when the disease broke out in Germany we should, on the instant, prohibit imports during the time it existed.

865. You have stated already that the first intimation that you had of the importation of diseased animals which caused the present outbreak was after they were being landed here?—Two hours after they were landed we had the official information from Germany of the existence of cattle plague in Hamburg.

866. I understand from your answer that some of those cattle were actually dying of the disease when

Professor *Brown.*

15 May 1877.

Mr. *Ritchie*—continued.

when they arrived here?—One died immediately that it was taken out of the ship, on the shoot.

867. Do you think that the disease could have been detected in those animals at the time they were embarked?—I should say that a careful inspection of the animals must have led to the detection of the disease.

868. Have you ever considered whether it would be possible to have any kind of inspection at the port of embarkation?—I do not think that any inspection that could be made on the landing-place at the port of embarkation would be sufficient to protect us from cattle plague, because it must include an examination by the aid of the thermometer, and it is almost impossible that in the hurry of shipping animals any such examination could be made.

869. I find at Question 1114 of the previous inquiry, that Mr. Alexander Williams is asked in reference to this: "Where would you recommend it" (that is the inspection) "to take place; at the port of embarkation or debarkation?" And he answers: "I think a very small amount of money expended at the port of embarkation would produce a greater result than a larger amount at the port of debarkation or landing;" do you agree with that?—I do not.

870. You say that you do not think that any inspection on the landing-place would be sufficient; where do you think that the inspection ought to take place to be efficient?—I cannot imagine that we should place any reliance upon inspection unless it is conducted by our own inspectors some time after the animals have been landed in this country.

871. But I understood you to say that this very cargo which brought the cattle plague into the country, would certainly have been detected if there had been any inspection at the port of embarkation?—I have no doubt that it would.

872. Therefore if there had been anyone there representing us, whose duty it was to inspect the cattle, the disease would have been detected, and its importation would have been prevented?—In that case the inspector must have had access to the premises where the cattle were standing before they were shipped.

873. You do not think that by a mere examination of animals at the wharf he would have been able to detect the presence of this disease?—If it had been known that an inspector was on the wharf waiting for those animals, they certainly would not have been sent; but under such conditions the exporters would take care to remove all the diseased animals, and only send those which had been herded with them, which in all probability would give no evidence of disease perhaps for a day or two after they were shipped.

Mr. *Ritchie*—continued.

874. Then you cannot suggest, with regard to the question of inspecting animals before they are shipped, any means which strike you as being accessible, by which the shipment of diseased animals could be prevented?—I am afraid that it would be very difficult for us to make any arrangements with foreign governments by which we should obtain what would practically be control of the animals before they were shipped.

875. Does your difficulty simply lie in the difficulty of making such arrangements with foreign governments?—It would lie in making such arrangements as would enable our inspectors to visit the premises where the animals were kept before they were shipped, and in making such further arrangements as would enable them to identify those animals that had passed their inspection when they were shipped.

876. But if such arrangements could be made, do you think that it would be advisable?—I think that it would be advisable, but the cost and difficulty would be very great.

877. Which would be the greater cost to the consumers here, the prohibition of all importation of animals from Germany, or the efficient inspection at the port of embarkation?—Certainly efficient inspection would be less costly if it could be carried out with the same results.

878. I think I understood that you had modified your opinion as to the symptoms of disease, and that you admit that you yourself have condemned animals as labouring under cattle plague which you now know were not suffering from cattle plague?—I have.

879. I think you stated that the last so-called outbreak at Hull ten days ago was not real cattle plague?—No; I merely said that the collateral evidence is opposed to the evidence obtained from an examination of the animals.

880. And that you yourself would be disposed therefore to think that it was not a case of real cattle plague?—At this distance of time I should; but if I had been compelled to give an opinion upon an examination of the animals, and the post-mortem appearances, I should have felt bound to do as Mr. Duguid did.

Thursday, 17th May 1877.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Major Allen.
Mr. Assheton.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. Chaplin.
Sir George Jenkinson.
Colonel Kingscote.
Sir Rainald Knightley.
Mr. Norwood.
Mr. Arthur Peel.
Sir Henry Selwin Ibbetson.
Mr. Torr.

SIR HENRY SELWIN IBBETSON, BART., IN THE CHAIR.

Professor GEORGE THOMAS BROWN, re-called; and further Examined.

Sir *George Jenkinson.*

881. In your evidence on the first day you mentioned one case in North London which you had considered, in the first instance, as a very doubtful case, many of the symptoms being very much of the cattle plague order; but you said that you came to the conclusion, finally, that it was not cattle plague; could you state what was the disease of which the animal died?—In the case referred to in North London, the animal was evidently suffering from what is known as gastro-enteritis, an inflammation of the stomach and intestines. I did not see the post-mortem examination, but Professor Simonds was kind enough to do so, and, as he will be examined, probably he will give you a more exact account than I have.

882. That is somewhat of the same nature as enteric or typoid fever with human beings, is it not?—No; it is quite distinct from typhoid fever in the human being. In that disease there is a distinct morbid condition of the intestinal glands; but in this disease in cattle, the intestinal glands are in no way implicated.

883. But you were satisfied that it was not cattle plague, although the symptoms resembled it in many particulars?—I was inclined to suspect that it was not cattle plague, from the conditions generally; and the history of the case has convinced me that it could not have been cattle plague, because the other animals still remain in perfect health. That is since 1st May, which is now nearly 18 days since.

884. With regard to the safety to be obtained from the non-importation of live cattle, is it not the fact that Ireland prohibits all importation of live stock from anywhere during the prevalence of cattle plague?—I believe it is.

885. Has not Ireland always remained entirely free from cattle plague?—Cattle plague was introduced in 1866 into the district of Drumra, in the north of Ireland. I saw a considerable number of animals there suffering from the disease, and I remained some six weeks in the country, making investigations respecting it; so that, in that instance, the disease was introduced notwithstanding the prohibition of the importation from this country.

Sir *George Jenkinson*—continued.

886. Did it spread, or was it stamped out?—It appeared first in the north of Ireland, and it was subsequently in some way carried into the Midland Counties, in the Enfield district, shortly after it had ceased in the north. Its means of transit there were not traced exactly.

887. But it did not spread all over Ireland, did it?—It did not; chiefly in consequence of the very prompt and energetic action of the Irish Government; they adopted restrictions which were continental in their severity.

888. And you attribute the non-spreading of it to those very stringent regulations, and also to the non-importation of cattle from that time?—Undoubtedly.

889. Does not that impress you with a very strong sense of the necessity for non-importation of foreign live stock into this country, at all events during the prevalence of cattle plague?—I have no doubt of the absolute necessity of prohibiting imports of cattle from countries while cattle plague exists there.

890. Is it not safer to prohibit importation from all foreign countries, at all events during the prevalence of cattle plague?—I should conclude that countries which border on those in which cattle plague exists would adopt the most severe measures for their own protection; and the history of the last century proves that those measures have been successful in reference to those countries which in my scheme I should propose to leave out of the schedule.

891. In an answer which you gave the other day to a question put to you by the right honourable gentleman the Member for Bradford, you seemed to be of opinion that the amount of importation of live stock bore a very great proportion to the requirements of London; I think you said that 55,328 were imported into London from Germany, and he rather seemed to infer that that amount was necessary for the provision-producing power of London. In estimating the total number of live stock stopped from the London port, if the importation of cattle was prohibited, have you ever made any deduction for the existing live stock which would be saved from disease and death, and slaughter, to say nothing of the pre-

Professor *Brown.*
17 May 1877

Professor *Brown.*

17 May 1877.

Sir *George Jenkinson*—continued.

vention of losses to owners of stock if we did not import disease?—I have not made any such estimate, because I do not recognise any evidence that the losses which are said to occur were directly referable to the importation of live animals. I admit the losses, but I contend that those losses arise from the circumstance that the two diseases which are chiefly complained of, viz., foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia, which entered the country before live stock importation was permitted, have continued ever since, and have been allowed to spread over the country without any interference.

892. I was referring in my question to the losses from cattle plague?—In reference to cattle plague there is no doubt that those losses are directly traceable to the importation of cattle from Germany or Russia, and from those countries only.

893. Possibly my question was not quite clear; I do not think that you have answered the point which I wished to put, which is, that if we lost the quantity of meat which is assumed to be imported, viz., 55,000 live stock from Germany, should we not, on the other hand, gain very much by not having losses either in money or in meat, owing to the introduction of disease; I will illustrate it by the enormous losses which occurred in 1865 to 1867 in Cheshire, which I think you yourself put at one-third of a million head of stock, and a great many millions of money?—The total losses all over the country during that outbreak may be roughly stated at something like one-third of a million of cattle. The money loss I am not prepared to give, but I think it has been estimated at something like 5,000,000 *l.* We get no return from local authorities as to the cost of dealing with an outbreak of the kind, but I believe the estimate was something like 5,000,000 *l.*

894. There is no doubt, is there, that in those years, the cattle plague was originally introduced from abroad?—There is no doubt at all.

895. And all that enormous amount of losses both in number of animals and in money value would have been saved if we had not imported that disease?—Undoubtedly it would, but it would also have been to a large extent saved, if instead of trying experiments in the mode of treatment when the disease did appear, we had adopted the continental system which had been in use for at least a century, and stamped out the disease as we have done on those occasions when it has appeared in this country since that time.

896. I think you spoke, in answer to the right honourable Member the other day, of the price of meat going up considerably, if we stop the importation of live stock?—I apprehend that that would be the case.

897. Then in a subsequent part of your evidence you said that the price of meat has not at present gone up, but that if anything, it has rather fallen; I take it that that is due to the fact that we have stopped the importation of live stock to London since the present outbreak; is not that so?—We stopped the importation of live cattle from Germany and Belgium at a period of the year when very few cattle come, so that the loss on that score has been exceedingly trifling.

898. But as a matter of fact during this outbreak we have stopped the importation of cattle, and the price of meat has not gone up?—We have stopped the importation from Germany and Belgium only.

Sir *George Jenkinson*—continued.

899. But that is the locality from which we have usually imported live stock, is it not?—Not during this season. The season during which the importation has been stopped has been one during which we get scarcely any animals from Germany; the real trade does not commence until the Schleswig-Holstein cattle come, namely, in the summer.

900. According to the Blue Book, the German supply is 55,328 against 6,200, which is the highest figure that I see from any other country; the number reported from Denmark is about 33,000 I think?—The importation placed under the head of "Germany" includes the cattle from Schleswig and Holstein, from which places we get our largest supplies.

901. With regard to the present import, have you seen a Return which I moved for, and which was issued yesterday morning from your department?—Yes.

902. By this Return, it appears that since the present outbreak there have been something like 45 separate cases, 34 have died, 214 have been killed, sick, and 835 have been slaughtered supposed to be sound, making a total of 1,083. If we had not imported the disease, that would have been saved, would it not?—It would, undoubtedly.

903. And we have not tampered with the disease in this case, as you intimated had been done in the former case?—We did not get rid of it so quickly as we might have done, if we had had larger powers to deal with it, when it was first discovered.

904. But we have stamped it out by immediate slaughter in every case during the present outbreak, have we not?—We have.

905. Do you not think that if that had been saved, it would have been a considerable gain to the community, the consumers?—Undoubtedly it would.

906. Especially in the way of milk, because by this Return I see that nearly the whole of the animals attacked are dairy cows?—Yes, that is the case.

907. Do you not consider milk a very important article of food, especially for the poorer classes, almost as much so as meat?—Undoubtedly, it is a most important article of food.

908. So that that represents a very serious loss; more so, possibly, in the case of dairy cows, than if it had been ordinary store stock?—I do not apprehend, speaking generally, that the loss has been very serious, because we have heard no complaints of a scarcity of milk; and it is rather a remarkable circumstance that, notwithstanding the prevalence of fatal diseases on certain occasions among dairy cows, nobody seems to get a less supply of milk in consequence. During 1866 and 1867 the price of milk was very much increased, but I believe that everybody got some fluid that went by the name of milk, to any extent that was required.

909. Would not that refer rather to rich people who can buy it at any price, than to poor people who at all times obtain it with great difficulty?—I believe that the price was increased first to the extent of a 1 *d.* and then 2 *d.*, which of course would be a consideration to poor persons; but the loss of a little over 1,000 dairy cows would not

Sir *George Jenkinson*—continued.

not seriously decrease the milk supply of the country.

910. What amount of money loss do you think that that number would represent?—We have no means of discovering, but on a rough estimate, I think, we might say something like 16,000*l.*

911. That is putting them at about 15*l.* per head?—At about that sum.

912. That is rather low, is it not?—Then, there is a general set-off in the way of salvage received for animals sent to the butchers.

913. You were speaking of foot-and-mouth disease just now, and there seemed to be some slight discrepancy in your former evidence which possibly might be reconciled; do you not consider that foot-and-mouth disease can be carried by other animals, such as dogs or rabbits, or birds; otherwise, how do you account for cases, such as I have known on my own estate, of a herd of young animals in the centre of the estate, with no possibility of contact with any other cattle, being attacked by the foot-and-mouth disease?—I have no doubt that it may be carried by those means, and there is reason to believe that it occasionally is so carried; but, in reference to the contagious character of the foot-and-mouth disease, I merely say that, so far as concerns its conveyance by immediate contagion, it takes a place second to cattle plague. The history of the foot-and-mouth disease goes to show that it is not generally conveyed in these ways. I may suggest as an illustration, the circumstances to which I have previously alluded, that during the last two years we have landed nearly 30,000 animals affected with foot-and-mouth disease. During those two years, commencing with the latter part of 1875, when we landed 19,000 diseased animals, foot-and-mouth diseased began to decline. During 1876, when we landed between 8,000 and 9,000 diseased animals, the disease was commonly spoken of as entirely ceased, although it did exist in the country in various places it was in such a low state of prevalence that it was really looked upon as having been extinguished. Now, if we had during those two years landed 30,000 animals affected with cattle plague, no precautions which we could possibly have adopted would have prevented the extension of that disease all over the country.

914. Are you at all acquainted with the Port of Bristol?—I am very well acquainted with that port.

915. Is it not a very significant fact with regard to the contagious nature of the foot-and-mouth disease, that during the prevalence of it, it was almost impossible to get any cattle out of or through the Port of Bristol, without their being affected with foot-and-mouth disease?—That was in consequence of animals infected with the disease being placed in the Bristol Market every market day.

916. Were they from Ireland?—From Ireland.

917. That would go to show the extremely contagious nature of the disease, would it not?—Undoubtedly it proves the disease to be contagious when healthy animals come in contact with diseased ones.

918. Would you allow animals from Ireland, or from anywhere, to be landed at any port, exclusive of Bristol or Gloucester, without any inspection whatever?—I see no fair ground for

Sir *George Jenkinson*—continued.

dealing with Ireland otherwise than as part of the United Kingdom. I could not consistently stop the importation of animals from Ireland on the plea of foot-and-mouth disease, while I allowed animals to come from Scotland and from districts where the same disease existed without the slightest interference.

919. How do they come from Scotland; by railway, or by ship?—They come in both ways, but chiefly by railway.

920. Are they subject to no inspection?—None whatever.

921. Do you not consider that to be a source of danger?—Undoubtedly; I think that the movement of diseased and infected animals from one part of the United Kingdom to another is one of the principal causes of the distribution of disease.

922. With regard to the importation of dead meat from America. I think you spoke on the first day of the state in which the meat was killed in this country, and you said that it could not be landed from America, or elsewhere, in a better state than it would be in here on the day on which it was killed?—I conclude that it would be impossible to bring meat from any distance, and land it at any given point, in better condition than the meat of an animal which was recently killed, and properly dressed in this country.

923. A great deal of the meat in this country we know is killed when the animal is very hot, and after it has been overdriven about the streets; if the animal is killed in that heated and overdriven state, the meat naturally would not be in a good condition, and, probably, would not keep; but with regard to the dead meat importation trade from America, do you not think that when people have gone to so much expense as they have for the importation of this dead meat by fitting up ships, and so on, they would take care to have the cattle conveyed to the waterside in a proper state for killing, and that they would not kill them in a state in which the meat would not be likely to keep?—I am afraid in answering that question I must flatly contradict a very popular impression which exists, about the effects of driving, that is to say, the effects of exercise upon temperature. It is a perfectly well-known fact in physiology that driving, that is to say, submitting an animal to exertion does not produce anything like an accession of temperature which would amount to fever. The effect is that it simply distributes the temperature; it makes it apparent on the surface without increasing it in the interior of the body. Further than that, butchers are always very anxious to keep the animals quiet for some hours before they are killed, and I think I am correct in stating that a prevailing custom is to keep them without food for at least 12 hours, and sometimes 24 hours, before slaughtering; and in the slaughter-houses in the north of England you see, on entering, a placard giving the prices which are charged for slaughtering including two days' use of the "hunger-house," which means the place where the animals are shut up without any food during that time; so that I am bound to conclude that, generally speaking, butchers are sufficiently acquainted with the details of their own business not to kill animals in such a condition as that they would not be likely to keep, unless on some particular emergency they are absolutely forced to do it.

924. Then

Professor *Brown.*

17 May 1877.

Sir *George Jenkinson*—continued.

924. Then I take it that your answer assumes that every precaution is taken, and that no over-driving is practised in this country?—I am satisfied that over-driving is a constant practice in this country, but I do not think that, as a rule, animals are killed immediately after they have been submitted to that unfair amount of exertion.

925. I think you spoke the other day of the great difficulty that exists in Germany, or Schleswig Holstein, in getting cattle to the waterside, and of having proper abattoirs at which the cattle could be killed before the meat was embarked; do you not think that this is a question like the level of water or the law of supply and demand in trade?—I think, as I believe, I stated in an answer to that question that the effect on the growers of cattle would be to induce them to send the cattle to the other parts where they could get a market which would pay them as well with less trouble. So long as they could get as much for the live animal as they would get if they sent it here in the shape of dead meat, they would naturally adopt the more simple course of sending their animals to Paris and Berlin and other parts of the continent where meat is very dear.

926. But the dead meat trade, being an accomplished fact, is it not likely, like all other articles of trade, to find its own level, and to be adopted and carried out where it pays, and not where it does not pay?—That is quite the view I take of it; it is simply a question of whether it would pay or not.

Colonel *Kingscote.*

927. With regard to cattle coming from Ireland and Scotland, do you think it right that cattle should come from either place on board ship, and not be inspected on arrival at the ports?—As a general principle, I do not recognise the desirability of selecting animals on board ship for inspection and excluding those that are in a railway truck.

928. Do you think that both ought to be inspected?—I do; but then that involves my scheme of dealing with the cattle traffic of the country; because, while inspection makes us acquainted with the fact of the existence of the disease, it does nothing beyond that. We are constantly made aware of the landing of diseased animals from Ireland, and we know that even if the local authorities stop the diseased animals, those that have been herded with them are allowed to go free.

929. For instance, cattle landed at Bristol have to be inspected, and those landed at Gloucester go freely throughout the country without any inspection; you consider that state of things ought not to exist?—I do not think the inspection at Bristol prevents the subsequent movement of the animals to any extent.

930. You look upon the inspection at Bristol, then, as being of no advantage?—Excepting that it gives us information as to the existence of disease, I do not see what other good purpose it can serve.

931. That would apply to Gloucester, or to any other part, I presume?—It applies to every part where the inspectors merely report the existence of disease, and are not empowered to take any action. The only advantage that I think it has, is the information which they convey to the local

Colonel *Kingscote*—continued.

authorities which those authorities may act on if they choose under the Animals Order of 1875.

932. But for the prevention of the spread of the foot-and-mouth disease, or any other disease, would it not be, in your opinion, desirable that there should be inspection, and that, coupled with that inspection, there should be authority to prevent animals being moved from the ports, or in the country where they were infected with the disease?—Certainly, and at the same time I should extend that system to the whole of the country; I should as much prevent the movement of diseased animals from a farm, or from one county to another, as I should from one landing place to the interior of the country.

933. Of course there would be more difficulty in inspecting animals carried by rail, than there would be in inspecting animals conveyed by ships; how far would you let them go without stopping them if they were on the railway?—I should rely principally upon the detection of the disease at its centres of origin, and preventing the movement of diseased animals from those centres.

934. With regard to the "Castor" as to which you gave us the account of the disease coming in from Hamburg during this last outbreak, have you seen the official document which was sent by the authorities at Hamburg to the Government at Berlin?—I have not seen any official document which was sent to Berlin.

935. In the document that was sent as a sort of official document, was it not stated that the cattle on board the "Castor" had arrived at Hamburg on the 9th of January, and that they were not inspected until the 12th by the veterinary inspector on the same day that they were put on board the "Castor"?—I have not seen that document, but from the information which I obtained otherwise, I know that that was the case.

936. Therefore it proves very distinctly that cattle can come from very many parts of Germany and even from Russia to Hamburg or to any other ports with disease upon them, which may not be found out by the inspectors, and yet the disease may break out after they have got even to this country; there is nothing to prevent those cattle that come straight from Russia being put on board the ships at Hamburg with the disease upon them, and yet the inspectors would not be able to detect the disease?—That is quite impossible if the exporter exercised ordinary care to take away diseased animals; but it ought not to have been possible in this case where some of the animals were actually dying from the disease when they shipped.

937. Had no one power at Deptford to stop the ship from going from the dock after the disease was discovered?—The disease was not discovered until after the animals had been landed, and the ship had left. I believe there was no power vested in anybody to detain the vessel, but had it been known that the animals were infected with cattle plague, I have no doubt whatever that the inspectors would have taken upon themselves to stop the ship until it was disinfected as we did when we discovered it; but the ship was gone from Deptford, and we found it at another wharf.

938. Do you know whether it was the same person who embarked the cattle on board the "Castor" that embarked the cattle that went to Hull at the same time on board the "Hansa"?—It

Colonel *Kingscote*—continued.

—It was the same firm; there are two men in it.

939. Is the inspector at Hull who did not detect the cattle plague, but who thought that it was foot-and-mouth disease, a local inspector or a Government inspector?—He is a Government inspector, and a man of very large experience?—The cattle on board the "Hansa" must have been in very much better condition than those on board the "Castor," because some of them were kept alive for four or five days, I believe, and subsequently on examining them there were no evidences which excited suspicion of the existence of the disease.

940. As regards the inspectors whom you would appoint under your scheme all over the country, if the Government took all the regulations into its own hands, would it not free the local authorities from great expense in their inspection, and would it not be really cheaper in the end, putting aside where the money is to come from, for the Government to have the inspection, so saving very often a double authority among local authorities; for instance, where boroughs and counties merge into each other?—I have no doubt that the whole cost to the country would ultimately be less on account of the advantage which would be gained in suppressing disease which is now allowed to go in any direction without any restriction. The immediate cost would undoubtedly be greater than it is now.

941. Supposing that an inspector reports diseased cattle at Bristol or anywhere else, does it not enable the local authorities to act with greater vigour if they choose?—It does. I mention that as the chief advantage in the system.

942. It strengthens their hands?—It strengthens their hands.

943. Do you consider the Act of 1869 sufficient to meet the present requirements of the country?—I do not think that its provisions are sufficiently elastic; I mean by that that there are so many cases laid down where you are bound to proceed in a certain direction quite irrespectively of the local conditions.

944. Would you advise that the Act should be amended, or that a new Act should be brought in in its stead?—I should advise that some short Act should take the place of the present Act, giving the Privy Council power to make such regulations as may be necessary in various districts.

Mr. *Arthur Peel*.

945. You regard pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease, I think, to use your own expression, as naturalised in this country?—I should say, considering that they have remained in this country between 30 and 40 years, and have never entirely ceased during that time, that we may speak of them as diseases of foreign origin, which have become naturalised.

946. Do you think that they would go on without any foreign supply?—My impression is that they would, and all the evidence goes to show that they would.

947. Have you formed the same opinion with regard to cattle plague?—I am quite clear that cattle plague does not appear in this country, unless it is introduced from Germany and Russia.

948. Is it known at all, scientifically, what are the predisposing causes to cattle plague?—So far as we can judge, there are no particular predisposing causes. As a matter of fact, some of the animals in the dirtiest cowsheds in London altogether escaped during the outbreak of 1865; and those in such sheds as Lord Granville's and Lady Burdett Coutts, where everything was perfect, were the earliest attacked.

Mr. *Arthur Peel*—continued.

949. I understood you to say, that dead meat was capable of conveying the disease?—Undoubtedly it is.

950. In a slighter degree, of course, than the living animal?—Much less, naturally.

951. In the case of stock in contact with diseased animals being killed, what supervision is exercised over the meat that is sent into the market from the animals so slaughtered?—During the time the local authorities were acting, I believe they allowed their inspectors to decide whether or not the animal was fit for food, and under that system we are aware that many animals in the earlier stage of the disease were considered fit for food and were sent into the market. Since the Privy Council has had to deal with cattle plague in the metropolitan police district, the inspectors have been instructed to deal with every animal as diseased which gave any indication of fever by rise of internal temperature, which would be the earliest symptom that could be observed.

952. In the case of an animal which indicated an increased temperature, would that meat be condemned?—The animal would be slaughtered and buried whole.

953. So that in no case where the disease was exhibited in the intestines, would that meat be sent into the market?—Certainly not, under that system, if the inspectors did their duty.

954. But, of course, the disease might be latent, incubating in the animal?—It might.

955. In that case, is there any reason to suppose that the meat would be unwholesome?—If we may judge from the experience of those parts of the country where cattle plague was most rife in 1865, 1866, and 1867, no harm would result from the consumption of that meat, because it is beyond all question that tons of it were consumed, and no disease among human beings was noticed as a consequence of such consumption.

956. Was it observed that the disease was communicable through the milk of an animal in which disease was incubating?—No. It was noticed, I believe, by the medical officers that there was nothing during the whole of that time which was at all special as a disease among human beings, and certainly nothing that could be traced to the consumption of diseased animals or of any of the products from them.

957. With regard to the powers required to be given to the Privy Council, I think you said that increased power was needed for the slaughter of healthy animals which had been in contact with diseased animals?—Not with regard to animals in contact with diseased animals; we have already the power to slaughter those.

958. Then you want the power to slaughter animals within a certain radius?—Within a certain radius; animals which are not in contact with diseased animals, but which have nevertheless been exposed to infection.

959. Would you limit that radius in any way?—If I were simply instructed to get rid of cattle plague at all risks and at any cost, I should prefer to have no limit at all.

960. Would not even the German limit co ntent you?

Professor *Brown.*

17 May 1877.

Mr. *Arthur Peel*—continued.

you?—I think the German limit is a very elastic one.

961. It is a mile, is it not?—Yes, in reference to the slaughter of animals I think the slaughter is very often necessary.

962. Irrespective of any radius?—Quite so.

963. Do you think that the compensation given for slaughtered animals is so inadequate as to induce secrecy on the part of the owners of diseased animals?—I stated to the Committee in 1873 that I should prefer always giving full compensation, chiefly for the purpose of inducing owners to give notice of disease. That would be my direct object.

964. I noticed in your evidence as to Hamburg that 300 cattle had been compensated for to the amount of 15,000 *l.* I suppose that is in your view altogether an extravagant system of compensation?—I do not reckon the price per head. I merely read from the official statement which I have got from a German authority, but I presume that would include all the cost. It was stated that the whole cost to the Government was 15,000 *l.*; I presume that includes such things as burning down premises and digging up floors, and burying manure, and destroying everything which they think may possibly convey the contagion.

965. You do not attach much importance to the danger arising from the manure of these diseased animals?—Supposing that it is ploughed in at once I should apprehend no risk; but we have always dealt with it as if it were the most deadly material possible; we have mixed it with its weight of quicklime and buried it, or in cases where we could not otherwise dispose of it we were compelled to send it out to sea.

966. With regard to the last recommendation of the Select Committee of 1873 as to foot-and-mouth disease, "That power should be given to the Privy Council to allow the movement, under proper precautions, of animals so affected, for slaughter, food, or shelter, inconvenience having been found to result from the absence of such power." I understood you to say that that had been carried out; but how would the Privy Council be competent to issue an Order to give themselves that power?—I alluded to the latter part of the 57th section of the Act, which provides that, "Notwithstanding anything in this section, the Privy Council may from time to time, by Order, make such further or other provision as they think expedient respecting animals becoming affected with foot-and-mouth disease, or any other contagious or infectious disease not being cattle plague, pleuro-pneumonia, sheep-pox, or glanders, while exposed, or placed, or being carried, led, or driven as aforesaid, and any such Order shall be deemed part of this section." Under that section the Privy Council passed an Order giving power to move animals that became affected during the time they were exposed in a market, while they were being driven along a public road.

967. Smithfield is exclusively a dead meat market, is it not?—Entirely.

968. When was the change made?—I forget the exact date, but it was some years ago.

Chairman.

969. It was after the Dead Meat Market Inquiry?—It was. It was merely a removal of the dead meat market from Newgate market across to the Smithfield site.

Chairman—continued.

970. Was that at the time of the setting up of the Islington market for live stock?—No, that market was set up long before the Smithfield market.

Mr. *Arthur Peel.*

971. Was the Smithfield market in substitution for the Newgate market?—I do not think that it was a substitution; it was merely a removal of the meat market which used to be on the right-hand side in Newgate-street beyond the Old Bailey, to a more commodious site. The origin of the dead meat market was before my time, I believe.

972. Whenever the dead meat trade in London was established, I suppose it has grown immensely in its proportions?—It has undoubtedly.

Major *Allen.*

973. In reference to the increase of compensation, if you give greater compensation for the slaughter of animals, of course you reduce the probability of concealment on the part of the owners of herds?—I think you do to some extent.

974. And if that compensation were given, then the Privy Council might take upon themselves still more stringent measures to restrict the movement of animals?—They might.

975. Are you aware that in Somersetshire we have adopted the most stringent rules that the Privy Council will allow us to adopt as regards the movement of animals?—I am aware of that.

Mr. *Chaplin.*

976. I gather from your evidence that upon the whole you consider that the only practical mode of dealing with cattle plague, with a view of getting rid of it in this country altogether, is to prohibit the importation of live cattle from those countries where cattle plague has been certified to exist?—From Germany, as a country which is liable to frequent incursions of the disease on the eastern frontier; and from Belgium, as a country of transit.

977. Do you mean perpetual exclusion of cattle from Germany?—Yes, if it is asserted that we are to protect ourselves, and to obtain perfect security, the only method that I see of obtaining that perfect security is to totally prohibit the importation of live cattle from Germany and Belgium. Of course Russia is always included, because we do not think of having cattle from there.

Chairman.

978. That is placing Germany and Belgium in the same position that for some years Russia has been placed in?—Yes.

Mr. *Chaplin.*

979. With regard to the dead meat trade from America, do you think that that trade is likely to continue at its present rate, or even to increase?—I only give an opinion upon that subject from what I have heard from various sources, and the impression which I get is, that the trade is likely to continue if the prices go up, but that it will not continue when the price which can be obtained in the American towns, approaches more nearly to the price which can be obtained in this country.

980. As to whether it is likely to approach that price or not in America, are you able to give an

Mr. *Chaplin*—continued.

an opinion?—I have heard it suggested that when the expected return of prosperity in the trade of those towns occurs there will be a larger demand for meat, and there will be less temptation for the exporters to send it here.

981. Assuming that it does continue at its present rate, or assuming that it increases, and that cattle plague was permanently banished from this country by prohibiting the importation of live cattle through Germany and Belgium, what, in your opinion, would be the ultimate effect upon the price of meat in this country?—The price of meat, I believe, depends very little indeed upon the supply; I imagine that it is more connected with the purchasing power, and the yearly increasing number of consumers. I apprehend that an increased supply means an increased consumption to the extent of the individual's means, and that the effect of an increase of price is to diminish consumption. I believe that cheap meat means the consumption of about twice as much meat as anybody requires, that they eat what they can get, and not what they want.

982. I understand then that you are not of opinion that to prohibit the importation of live cattle would injuriously affect the price, that is to say, would increase the price?—I have no doubt that it would increase the price at once.

983. But ultimately what would be the effect of such a prohibition?—Ultimately if an equivalent supply were obtained from any source in the shape of dead meat, it would leave prices very much as they are now.

984. I understood you to say that you drew up a memorandum suggesting alterations or additions to the regulations as to cattle plague, which ought to be adopted in consequence of the recent outbreak, and which would be attended with advantage in case of any future outbreak?—That was a memorandum which was addressed to the local authorities.

985. Would those suggestions be best carried out by the local or by the central authority?—Undoubtedly by the central authority, because the local authority is deficient in the necessary machinery.

986. Then, in the case of an outbreak, with a view of stamping it out in the speediest and the most effectual manner, you think that the Privy Council ought to supersede the local authorities in all cases?—I think that that would be the most effective and economical method of proceeding.

987. The cost, I understood you to say, would be somewhat greater?—In the first instance, the cost undoubtedly would be greater.

988. But it would be more than compensated for by the saving in cattle, I suppose?—By the saving in the number of cattle and the saving in the time during which those restrictive measures would be necessary.

989. I think you said that the loss from cattle plague in 1865 to 1867, as nearly as you were able to tell, was about one-third of a million animals?—It was in round numbers; it was over 300,000.

990. You said, did you not, that in this recent outbreak the cost to the country has been about 10,000 *l.* or 12,000 *l.*?—I stated that last time at a guess. The return which I have will show that the loss was something like 16,000 *l.*; that is, allowing 15 *l.* a head for each animal, and not deducting any salvage.

Mr. *Chaplin*—continued.

991. And that is all the loss that we have undergone in the last five years since 1872?—That is all the money loss.

992. In answer to the Member for Manchester, the last time we met, I think you said that it was possible that we might go on for another five years with only a similar loss?—I should hope to go on for at least that time without another outbreak.

993. But I suppose that it is equally possible that we might undergo as severe a loss as we did in 1865–67?—I cannot imagine the possibility of that, because, even with our present system, if the disease had shown the slightest tendency to spread to any distance, I have not the slightest doubt that the Privy Council would have stopped the movement of cattle and fairs and markets over the whole country.

994. Then you do not think that we need apprehend, under any circumstances, so severe a loss as we had before?—I should say that it is a moral impossibility.

995. There is no cattle plague in America, I understand?—There is a Texan cattle disease which is very destructive, and has very remarkable characteristics, inasmuch as the animals which give the disease to others do not appear to suffer much from it themselves. It is said to arise from the manure being dropped on the herbage along the road which those cattle take, and other cattle feeding off the same ground become fatally affected in consequence.

996. But there has been no instance of that disease being imported into this country?—No; that is a misfortune which probably is still hanging over us.

997. Then you anticipate its possibility?—I apprehend that it is possible.

998. My object in asking this question was to arrive at your opinion, as to whether it was probable at any time in the future that it might be desirable to stop the importation of dead meat from America?—I apprehend that there would be no risk of carrying this disease by means of dead meat.

999. Supposing the importation of dead meat as well as of live cattle from affected countries in Europe was prohibited, we should still be able, you think, to receive an undiminished supply of dead meat from America?—Undoubtedly.

Mr. *Norwood.*

1000. With reference to the question which has just been put to you by the honourable Member for Mid-Lincolnshire, as to the ultimate effect upon the price of meat of a continued importation from America, I did not quite understand that you had denied the broad principle, that the cost of meat would be regulated by the law of supply and demand, though you rather seemed to imply it?—So far as I can judge from what I have seen and from what I have read, the supply of meat, which must be limited, does not materially affect the cost to the consumer.

1001. You mean to say that there is sufficient consumptive demand to take off all our supplies at something like the present price?—It seems to me that the more meat a person can get the more he is likely to eat.

1002. Then you think that the agriculturists of this country have no reason to fear any serious diminution of the price of their production by a liberal import of foreign meat?—I apprehend not,

Professor *Brown.*

17 May 1877.

Mr. *Norwood*—continued.

not. I imagine that as long as people can pay for meat they will have it.

1003. Then it is not the interest of the agriculturist, you think, to restrict merely in a pecuniary, and I may say selfish, point of view the importation of meat?—I should not like to accuse them of acting from that motive.

1004. I suppose that there are large masses of our country people that really scarcely know the taste of meat?—There are undoubtedly.

1005. And it would benefit those poor creatures if they had the opportunity of eating meat?—Undoubtedly it would.

1006. I will take some answers of yours in rotation; some questions were put to you by the honourable Chairman as to the deficient arrangements which you stated to exist in certain ports, and Hull was referred to; is it not the fact that a new scheme has been submitted to and approved by your department very greatly to improve the state of things in Hull?—I admit that the proposed arrangements will improve the condition of things at Hull, but the port will still not be in a perfectly satisfactory condition.

1007. I believe that the proposed arrangement is that the present English cattle market, comprising some three acres, is to be given up to the foreign cattle, the corporation erecting slaughter-houses there, so that the foreign cattle once entering, will not be allowed to leave alive, and that the English cattle market is to be removed to a distance of a couple of miles from the landing-place for foreign cattle?—That is the scheme, and it is a great improvement upon the previous arrangement.

1008. Looking at the peculiar position of Hull, being a large port, is not that perhaps the best arrangement that is feasible?—So far as the present powers of the corporation appear to extend, it seems to be the best arrangement that could have been made.

1009. Have you reason to complain of a want of energy or zeal on the part of the Hull corporation during the present year?—Certainly not.

1010. Have they seconded your wishes with vigour and promptitude?—I believe they have adopted every suggestion that has been made.

1011. At once?—At once.

1012. There have been three cases of outbreak, I think, in Hull this year; as to the last outbreak, I think you stated that you had some doubt about its being really cattle plague, from the fact that it had occurred at a very considerable period of time after the former outbreak?—That was the ground of my conclusion.

1013. But supposing that self-same outbreak had occurred within three weeks instead of six weeks of the last case, you would have changed your mind?—Three weeks would have been a very long time.

1014. Say a fortnight?—If it had been a fortnight or ten days, I should have had no particular doubt about the matter.

1015. It appears that cattle may have some kind of disease of a very similar description and character to cattle plague, and whether or not it is to be considered cattle plague entirely depends upon the length of time that has elapsed since a previous outbreak?—That would influence one's opinion to a large extent.

1016. Then there must be a disease very nearly akin to cattle plague which is prevalent, but which is really not cattle plague?—There are several diseases which have symptoms very closely allied to those of cattle plague.

Mr. *Norwood*—continued.

1017. And you very frankly stated that in your experience in former years, you had in some cases considered cattle plague to exist in which you think now with mature judgment it did not exist?—I remember some cases in which I am perfectly certain that it did not exist.

1018. In the first case of outbreak in Hull from the "Hansa," your inspector positively declared that it was pleuro-pneumonia, and was not cattle plague, and in fact there was no suspicion of cattle plague in that case was there?—There was no suspicion of cattle plague at the time and from his post-mortem examination, he concluded that the animal had some inflammation of the throat; but pleuro-pneumonia, which he first suspected he found, did not exist, the lungs being perfectly healthy.

1019. I have then, to a certain extent, accounted for two outbreaks out of the three; now are you absolutely certain in your own mind that even the intermediate outbreak was pure cattle plague?—I at the time entertained some doubt about the matter, but no investigation was made.

1020. Then it is within the range of possibility that not one of the cases of so-called cattle plague in Hull this year, was really cattle plague?—I think I may say that it is within the range of possibility, but the history of the first outbreak is quite consistent with the idea of cattle plague.

1021. I think the reason why you came to the conclusion that it might have been cattle plague was that you traced the fact of some of the animals by that ship having left the same lair, as in that case which you had at Deptford?—That was the chief reason, coupled with the fact that two of those animals showed some symptoms which might be taken to represent cattle plague in the early stage.

1022. Does it not appear to you that considering the uncertainty that exists as to the real cattle plague or false cattle plague, it is rather a serious matter to prohibit the importation from Germany altogether to this country?—No; because I think there can be no question at all that we did get cattle plague of the most pronounced kind introduced into this country by those animals which were brought over on board the "Castor"; and the history of the progress of the disease in the metropolis and in Essex would be sufficient to convince me, even if I had not identified the affection on its entrance here.

1023. I think you have no hesitation whatever in your mind as to the impossibility of cattle plague existing in England without originating from foreign contagion?—I am quite clear upon that point. I may say, in reference to the difficulty of identifying cattle plague, that I refer only to exceptional cases. In the majority of instances there is not the slightest difficulty in detecting cattle plague when the symptoms are all fairly developed.

1024. I think a couple of days ago you received a letter from the town clerk of Hull forwarding your intimation as to the fact that they had taken every step to ascertain if there had been any movement, in the dairy sheds, of cows or of cattle, to account for the last outbreak, and I believe his statement to you was very decisive that there had been none?—He stated distinctly that no stock had been removed from any dairies excepting those

Mr. *Norwood*—continued.

those in which cattle plague had previously existed, and that no circumstances had occurred to lead to any suspicion that the disease had existed between 22nd March and 5th May.

1025. With reference to Hull, it is the gate to the West Riding, and to the dense manufacturing populations of Lancashire and Yorkshire, is it not?—It is.

1026. And therefore the importance of the import through Hull to this district, which was dwelt upon by the right honourable gentleman the Member for Bradford, a connection with London will apply, though perhaps, in a somewhat smaller degree as to the question of food for the poor?—Undoubtedly.

1027. You suggested some very stringent regulations with reference to the control over vessels, and crews, and persons, bringing over cattle from abroad; I suppose it has struck you that any such restrictions would enormously enhance freights?—I have no doubt that they would.

1028. And possibly they would enhance freights to such an extent as really to prohibit the importation of cattle from anywhere?—I do not think they would; the profits on the cattle trade are very considerable.

1029. I am talking more especially about Hull. I think that there are no vessels trading to Hull with cattle that are exclusively fitted for cattle, but they convey other cargo?—They do, all of them.

1030. Of course any severe restrictions upon those vessels would necessarily tend to cripple their proceedings very greatly indeed?—It would have the effect of driving most of those vessels out of the cattle trade, but I apprehend that some of them would be selected for the purpose, or others would be built, as they are in London, exclusively for carrying cattle.

1031. The importations into Hull are not upon such a large scale as the importations into London; do you think that it would be practicable, and payable, to devote Hull vessels exclusively to that trade?—I think that probably one vessel might be made to take the place of half-a-dozen, and larger cargoes might be brought in them, instead of small ones.

1032. Has it struck you that there would be a great hardship to the poor consumers not having the fresh offal in the way that they have now, from the cattle being slaughtered at the port of debarcation?—I do not think that that objection is a very strong one, because offal is now constantly sent from Deptford to Birmingham and Manchester, and other large towns.

1033. I am aware that that is the case, and always has been the case, and that is the basis of my question. We send from Hull all these kind of offal to Birmingham, and Manchester, and Leeds, and Bradford; but, supposing the offal to be sent from Hamburg, would it not make a very material difference as to the condition of the article at the time it reaches the consumer?—Undoubtedly; unless it was sent over properly preserved by means of a cooling apparatus.

1034. You are aware that the head, the pluck, the tripe, and the internal offal, and even the blood are articles very much desired by the poor, and eagerly bought by them?—I am aware that the offal is, but I was not aware that the blood was used in any way by the poor.

1035. Supposing that it was possible to convey

Mr. *Norwood*—continued.

that offal from Hamburg, as offal, would it not be a very costly operation, as well as a very difficult operation to effect, from the nature of the article itself?—I should think that the conveyance of offal would take place in connection with the establishment of a dead meat trade with Hamburg, under some such system as that which is adopted in carrying the meat from America.

Professor *Brown.*

17 May 1877.

1036. And that system, you say, has not yet been fully tested, and you are not personally acquainted with it?—I am not.

1037. Do you not think that the great loss that occurred to the country from the outbreak of cattle plague in 1866-67 would have been greatly mitigated if the country had been prepared for it, and if your Department had been in its present efficient state, and able to cope with it?—I have no doubt that we should have dealt with it as we have dealt with subsequent outbreaks.

1038. I think you have stated that you do not apprehend any such serious loss occurring again?—I cannot imagine that such a loss is at all possible.

1039. You do not know of any refrigerators being adopted in any other trade but the American trade?—I am not aware that they have been adopted in any other trade.

Chairman.

1040. In answer to the right honourable gentleman the Member for Bradford, you stated that you were aware of the Report of the Committee of 1873, and you were examined rather in detail upon it; has that Report of 1873 been considered by the Lord President's Department since that time?—I believe it has been frequently under the consideration of the Lord President; I judge from conversations which I have frequently had with the late Secretary, who was then in a position to bring these matters under the Lord President's notice.

1041. Was it thought advisable to introduce a Bill, and if not, what were the reasons which prevented a Bill being introduced to carry out those recommendations?—I believe it was not thought advisable to introduce a Bill to impose a few regulations, and it was believed that any more extensive measure including all the changes which would then have been suggested, would have led to a very great deal of discussion, and, in short, that in the then temper of the country, there would have been no chance whatever of getting those further powers which the Privy Council would have asked, if any new Bill had been introduced.

1042. At that time, cattle plague not being in the country, there would have been great difficulty in taking those stronger powers by an Act of Parliament?—There would; and there would probably have been a disinclination on the part of the chiefs of the department to press any such measure, because I am aware that the Secretary had a very strong belief in the efficacy of the international regulations which were the result of the Conference at Vienna in 1872. The German Government was equally strong in its convictions of the value of those regulations, and we were constantly pressed by the German Government to relax the restrictions which already existed.

1043. I suppose that the recommendations which required legislation principally related to the

Professor *Brown.*

17 May 1877.

Chairman—continued.

the cattle plague and pleuro-pneumonia?—Chiefly.

1044. With respect to the recommendations, you were asked this question, "Have you found an evil arising from the alteration contemplated by that recommendation not being carried out?" and you say, "Not during the last outbreak"; have you been able to deal with that under your existing powers?—During the last outbreak the local authorities have in nearly every instance slaughtered all the animals which were in contact with diseased ones. If they had refused to slaughter them, we could have acted under Section 75.

1045. That is the section which you have put in operation now with regard to the metropolis, is it not?—It is; on one occasion, where the local authority hesitated to slaughter the animals that were herded with the diseased ones, the Lord President himself insisted that the slaughter should take place; and at the moment that our officer had gone down to give the order the local authority's officer was there upon the same errand, so that we were not called upon to interfere.

1046. With regard to pleuro-pneumonia I suppose it was not thought expedient to legislate upon that, because of the question having been and being still under consideration as to dealing with it generally in the country?—I believe it was thought desirable to try the effect of the slaughtering order fairly, before any further legislation was had recourse to; and during the last two years that action taken by the local authorities has certainly produced some impression upon the disease.

1047. Another of the recommendations of the Committee of 1873 with regard to sheep-pox was that the slaughter of all sheep affected by it should be compulsory with compensation; why was not that carried out?—In the event of an outbreak of sheep-pox occurring we could have acted under the same 75th section, and have ordered slaughter if we had thought it necessary; but as a matter of fact we have succeeded in extinguishing the disease by the process of shutting up the farm on which the diseased animals were kept.

1048. And therefore it was not considered so pressing?—It was not.

1049. Then the recommendation that that Committee made with regard to glanders has not been carried out either, has it?—No; it was believed that so much difficulty would arise if inspectors had power to order the slaughter of valuable animals on the plea of their being affected with glanders, a disease which it is more difficult to recognise than cattle-plague, that it would be impossible to carry out any system of slaughter without at the same time giving compensation, which would involve sometimes very considerable cost.

1050. And that the recommendation was not a just recommendation, looking at the compensation?—It seemed to be unjust to pay a man for slaughtering an animal for pleuro-pneumonia, and to refuse to compensate a man for slaughtering a horse because it was affected with glanders, except to the extent of a few shillings. The present regulations amount almost to a power to slaughter inasmuch as local authorities have power to summon a person who owns a glandered horse, and make him show cause why he does not slaughter it. Unless he can show reasonable cause, they have power to compel him to slaughter.

Chairman—continued.

1051. With regard to the evidence which was given before the Committee in 1873, as to the slaughter at the port of debarcation, the Committee then recommended "That no change should be made in the Act so far as it relates to foreign animals, but that the Privy Council should continue to order the slaughter at the landing places of all foreign animals imported from countries in which cattle plague exists, or from which there is reason to fear it might be introduced." Has that been done?—That has been done.

1052. In fact, as soon as cattle plague appeared in England, you prohibited the import of cattle from Germany?—Yes, we went beyond that recommendation in that case, and stopped the import of live animals.

1053. Another recommendation of that Committee which was referred to, was as to the limitation of the ports at which animals can be landed; have you acted at all upon that?—We have struck out several ports where the arrangements were not sufficient, or the trade was unimportant, and we have also revoked several defining orders; so that the number of ports where cattle can now be landed from scheduled countries is exceedingly limited. There are only nine ports now where cattle from scheduled countries can be landed.

1054. How many have been reduced?—Seven out of sixteen.

1055. Will you mention the ports which have been stopped?—The ports which have been undefined are Dover, Glasgow, Granton, Leith, Littlehampton, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, and North Shields.

1056. And what are the nine ports which are now left?—Those are Goole, Grimsby, Hartlepool, Hull, London, Middlesborough, Plymouth, Southampton, and Sunderland.

1057. The right honourable gentleman referred next to that part of the recommendation which dealt with the foot-and-mouth disease, and which was adopted, I believe, by the Privy Council of that day; that was reversed, as I understand, in June 1874?—It was.

1058. What was the ground upon which it was reversed?—The ground was, that foot-and-mouth disease had again begun to spread over the country, and some agricultural societies, including the Royal Agricultural Society and certain local authorities, very urgently requested that they might have power to put in force certain regulations for their own protection, and this permissive power was granted.

1059. Then, I think, since that recommendation, you have dealt with the question of compensation, and you have altered the compensation; have you altered it in the sense in which it was suggested by the Committee that it should be altered?—Not precisely; the compensation which originally was one-half of the value of the diseased animal has been raised to three-fourths, the total sum not to exceed 30 *l.* The recommendation of the Committee was, that the owner should be compensated to the extent of three-fourths of the total loss which he had incurred in any way as a consequence of the disease; but I believe that it was found very difficult to make any reasonable calculation of the indirect loss which would be incurred by the owner

Chairman—continued.

owner in consequence of having his animals slaughtered.

1060. And that was the reason which led you not to adopt the suggestion in that case?—It was.

1061. With regard to the Irish trade, there was a good deal of difficulty about that, and suggestions with regard to it were made by the Committee; what has been done recently about that?—The Lord President has been constantly in communication with the Irish Government upon the subject, and in 1874 we appointed additional inspectors for the purpose of examining animals landed from Ireland at various ports in this country, in order that they might give notice to the local authorities to enable them to act under this permissive power which had been given them by the Order in June. An Act was also passed providing for the slaughter of animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia.

1062. That brought Ireland into the same position with regard to the compulsory slaughter for pleuro-pneumonia that this country is in, did it not?—It did.

1063. May I ask whether that is the reason why, in answer to a question which was put to you by an honourable Member to day; you stated that Irish cattle were still inspected at Bristol?—It was not in particular reference to pleuro-pneumonia, but in reference to contagious and infectious diseases generally.

1064. If they are inspected at Bristol, why are they not inspected at the other ports?—They are inspected at nearly all the ports where Irish animals are landed.

1065. Is it supposed to be a regulation of the Department that Irish cattle landed from Ireland, should pass under inspection?—So far as we know the points of landing, our object is to inspect the animals at all those points; but I may say that there is no restriction on the landing of cattle; they are not in the position of foreign animals, which can only be landed at certain parts.

1066. They are treated in the same way as cattle belonging to this part of the United Kingdom?—They are; any ship coming from any part of Ireland may bring cattle, and may land them at any landing place where it happens to be lying.

1067. The only thing that has been done with regard to the Irish trade has been to place the Irish trade, with regard to compulsory slaughter for pleuro-pneumonia, on the same footing as the English trade?—That has been done.

1068. You stated, in answer to the right honourable gentleman, that you had changed your opinion as to the question of cattle plague, and the necessary regulations with regard to it; is that in consequence of every year proving that our supplies are drawn from countries which are more distant from us, and over which we have less control?—That is one reason, and another reason is the fact that the facilities of transit are increasing every year, from the extension of lines of railway into those countries where cattle plague has a permanent existence.

1069. And that, instead of as formerly, getting from Germany, and from those countries, cattle that had been for some time in the country, and therefore had practically gone through a quarantine, we are now drawing our supplies more from the centre of the disease, namely,

Chairman—continued.

from parts of Russia?—Our supplies come through Germany; but we have no means of preventing the passage of animals from these centres of disease into the German empire in the first instance.

1070. And you do not agree with the right honourable gentleman's suggestion that it would be unreasonable to prohibit the import of cattle from places where cattle plague seldom exists, only because we do not get information from those places; but you think that it is a means of protection that we ought to adopt?—I think that it is quite reasonable, because the history of the recent outbreak goes to show that, with the greatest desire on the part of continental Governments to give us early information, they fail to give that information in time to enable us to prevent considerable damage.

1071. I think that one honourable Member, who questioned you as to your idea with regard to the stoppage of the German trade, asked you whether the prohibition of the German import, except for slaughter, had diminished the number of animals which had come to this country?—I believe the diminution has been unimportant, for the reason that during this time of the year we get very few cattle from Germany.

1072. There has been no variation in the prices in the market in consequence of the order prohibiting the free ingress of cattle from Germany?—None that I am aware of.

1073. You were asked also, with regard to the American supply, whether you were aware that it had not been tried in the summer; are you aware of a Return which has been made to the House of Commons, at the instance of an honourable Member, as to the importation of meat generally into the country?—I am.

1074. If you look at the column of "Imported Fresh Beef from the United States," I think that Return shows that a very large import, amounting to 9,000 cwt. in August last year, came in as fresh meat from America?—That appears from the Return.

1075. Have you any knowledge or information as to whether that meat came in proper condition to this country?—I am not aware, in reference to those particular cargoes, but I am told that a very large quantity of meat has been condemned as unfit for food.

1076. Is that recently, or was it at that time?—I have only heard recently of that having happened.

1077. These figures show that the trade has gradually risen from its commencement in January last year up to 9,200 cwt. in August, and to 35,000 cwt. in December; and that would rather lead to the inference, would it not, that the trade had not been a failure in August or they would not have continued it?—It would. The increase, of course, is very much greater in the colder months of September, October, November, and December.

1078. I think, in answer to a question which was put to you by an honourable Member with regard to slaughter, irrespective of radius, you were referring to the Pocklington case, were you not?—Yes, where the disease was first detected.

1079. Was what you meant by that, that if you had been able to slaughter the herds which had come in immediate contact with the farm on which the disease broke out, the probability is that you would have stopped the disease altogether, but that the power only enabled you to slaughter those animals upon the farm itself,

Professor *Brown.*

17 May 1877.

Chairman—continued.

which were in actual contact with the diseased animals?—That was my meaning.

1080. You mentioned the existence of a new disease in Texas, are you aware whether there is any import, or whether there is a growing import of live animals from America at the present moment?—There has been some increase in the number of live animals imported during the last few months.

1081. Do you think that disease is one that is likely to be imported into this country?—I am not in a position to speak very positively upon that point.

1082. Would it in your opinion be as necessary to take precautions against the introduction of the live meat from America, supposing the Texan disease to be as fatal a disease as it is represented to be, as against the introduction of disease from the continent?—I think from the little we know of the disease, we should be hardly justified in prohibiting the importation of live cattle from America. It seems so much to depend upon climate and to be so confined to the Gulf Coast, that in all probability it would not spread in this country even if animals in that particular condition were to arrive here.

1083. And you think that there would not be the danger of such a destruction of our herds from its coming suddenly upon us, as there was from the cattle plague coming upon us suddenly in 1865?—I apprehend not.

1084. I think that in answer to the honourable Member for Hull, you stated that the arrangements at Hull were very considerably improved?—They will be when the suggested changes are completed.

1085. I think that that was one of the ports which before the Committee of 1873 was referred to as being thoroughly insufficient in its arrangements with regard to its cattle market?—It was, with regard to the defined part of the port.

1086. And at that time, I think, you stated that you believed that the regulations which were necessary in London were equally necessary in all ports where foreign imports was allowed?—I did.

1087. That, I understand, has not up to the present moment been altered though it is in process of being altered?—It is in progress.

1088. Can you state what is the annual import of foreign stock to Hull?—I find that there were during the year 1876; 343 head of cattle; 1,185 sheep and 3,207 swine from Denmark; 6,796 head of cattle 15,599 sheep and 1,104 swine from Germany; 15,647 head of cattle, 2,931 sheep; and 1,310 swine from the Netherlands; 191 head of cattle, and 371 sheep from Norway; and three swine from Russia, which I presume came as surplus ships' stores.

1089. That makes a total of about 22,000 cattle imported into Hull for the district which they feed?—It does.

1090. I think the honourable Member asked you a question with regard to vessels conveying cattle alone into the Port of Hull; it would be quite possible, would it not, if the trade exists there to that amount that vessels could be set apart for that traffic alone?—Undoubtedly, as I think, the freight would return something like 1 *l.* per head for the cattle.

1091. I suppose that in your opinion, there is an immense increase of danger in cattle being brought in with other cargo?—So far as cattle plague is concerned, there can be no doubt of the fact.

Chairman—continued.

1092. It has always been the recommendation of the department, that where cattle import trade exists, it should be a trade carried out in ships devoted exclusively to that purpose, has it not?—It has.

1093. So that your inspection may be complete as to the introduction of disease?—Decidedly.

1094. With regard to the question of the import of offal, I think you stated in answer to the honourable Member, that a very large portion of the offal that is supplied to Manchester and other large towns, passes through London, and is carried down to those towns, and delivered fresh in competition with the offal of the beasts slaughtered in the place?—It is.

1095. Are you aware whether any quantity of that offal comes from abroad?—I know that a considerable quantity of offal does come from abroad, but I do not know what proportion.

1096. Are you not aware that a considerable number of tons of offal are imported from abroad and sent through to the towns, and yet on arriving there, it is able to compete with the fresh killed offal?—I am aware of that.

1097. Does that come from Hamburg?—I am told that a considerable quantity is brought from Vienna.

1098. That is under a state of things in which the new idea of these refrigerating modes of conveyance has not entered?—It is.

1099. And, therefore, if that is possible, as applying to the trade of London, it would be equally possible with the Hull trade?—Undoubtedly it would; I should perhaps explain in reference to Hull, that I should leave a large proportion of the German trade still at that port as all the cattle from Schleswig and Holstein, which under my system, would still be landed at a defined part of a port for slaughter, so that it is not total prohibition.

1100. So that under the scheme which you have proposed, Hull would practically not be placed in a different position from that which it is in at the present moment, either with regard to offal or with regard to the import of cattle?—It would not.

1101. In answer to an honourable Member, you stated that the system that you proposed as superseding the local authority, would be a more expensive system at first. I suppose that refers to the answer which you gave me before, that it would entail an additional number of inspectors in the first instance, the total number being from 1,800 to 2,000?—It would.

1102. But practically, the working of the system when once it was set in motion, would not necessarily be more expensive?—I believe not.

Mr. *Norwood.*

1103. Are you satisfied as to the offal being imported from Vienna in any quantity?—I am not quite satisfied; I believe I was told so by one of the importers.

1104. Then you rather qualify the direct assertion which you made?—I do not know it of my own knowledge.

Chairman.

1105. I understand that in answer to a question which was put to you by the right honourable gentlemen, the Member for Bradford, you hand in a paper showing the losses incurred in the last two outbreaks?—I do as nearly as we could obtain the information. (*The same was delivered in,* see *Appendix.*)

Professor JAMES BEART SIMONDS, called in, and Examined.

Chairman.

1106. YOU were connected, I think, with the Privy Council Department for many years, were you not?—From its foundation in 1865 to 1872, when I left the department.

1107. And you had to deal with the outbreak of cattle plague in 1865-66-67?—I had.

1108. Since 1872, you have ceased to be connected with the department, have you not?—I have entirely ceased to be connected with the department since 1872, having accepted office at the Royal Veterinary College as the principal.

1109. And therefore you have had nothing to do with the official work since that time?—Nothing whatever.

1110. From your previous experience in the department, and your experience now, will you give the Committee your opinion as to the effect of importation on the introduction of cattle diseases; that is to say, cattle plague, pleuro-pneumonia, and foot-and-mouth disease, into this country?—Both pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease existed in this country previously to the alteration in the tariff in 1842. Cattle plague was introduced for the first time in 1865, and remained until 1867, and produced of course very serious losses to the country; I do not think that either pleuro-pneumonia or foot-and-mouth disease have been materially added to as existing in the country from the time of their being first observed by the introduction of animals from abroad. They have been added to, to some extent, but I do not think materially.

1111. You are confining yourself now to pleuro-pneumonia and foot and mouth disease?—I am.

1112. Do you think that that applies to pleuro-pneumonia?—Undoubtedly, we run a greater risk of increasing the number of cases of pleuro-pneumonia in the country by our importation than we do with regard to foot and mouth disease.

1113. That is in consequence, I suppose, of the time which it takes to develop the disease?—Exactly so. Animals may be admitted from the continent, which give no evidence whatever of the disease, and the disease may manifest itself some weeks after those animals have arrived in the country.

1114. Do you still think that the introduction or importation of foreign stock has not in any way materially increased the pleuro-pneumonia, in the country?—I do not think it has materially increased the number of cases of pleuro-pneumonia, and I came to that conclusion from the simple fact that we had quite as many cases of pleuro-pneumonia in 1841 and 1842, as I think we have had in any other year since, and the same with regard to foot and mouth disease. I have stated previously to other Committees that in my experience the outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in 1839 raged to a greater extent in 1840 and 1841 than it has ever raged since, and was more destructive to life at that time than it has ever been since.

1115. That being before foreign importation existed to any extent?—Quite before the importation existed. The importation took place, if I remember rightly, about the middle of 1842. Oxen were brought in paying a rate of 1*l* a head; that limited the number considerably, and then after a short time they were brought in free. These serious outbreaks took place previously to that time.

Chairman—continued.

1116. Was there any evidence at the time of how the foot-and-mouth disease originated in this country?—No satisfactory evidence was obtained. It was thought that it was chiefly introduced through a morbid condition of the atmosphere; it was looked upon as an atmospherical disease, and it passed for some years under the name of the "epidemic among cattle." I have since thought that it was quite possible that it might have been introduced by surplusage stores brought in by the ships, because it first appeared in the neighbourhood of Stratford, not very far from the docks, and it spread from there gradually throughout the whole country.

1117. At that time, I suppose foreign cattle were introduced to the limited extent of what are called ships' stores?—Yes.

1118. Therefore there was the possibility, though you did not then form that judgment, of its being so introduced as a foreign disease?—Yes; I have thought so since, though I did not think so for some time afterwards. The facts which we have arrived at with regard to the spread of the disease have led me to the conclusion that the disease must have been introduced originally in some such way as that.

1119. Your subsequent conclusions led you to think that it was not spontaneously generated in the country?—Certainly.

1120. That is with regard to foot and mouth disease; have you formed any opinion as to how pleuro-pneumonia was introduced?—No. It has been however stated that some Dutch cattle were sent, I think, to the consul representing Holland, at Cork, and that it was in that way that pleuro-pneumonia was introduced; but if those Dutch cattle were so sent it was quite contrary to the law existing at that time, cattle being prohibited.

1121. Pleuro-pneumonia had not been known in the country before that, had it?—Not before then.

1122. With regard to cattle plague, I understood you to say that that was introduced here for the first time in 1865?—It was.

1123. And in your opinion that was brought in from abroad?—It was brought in undoubtedly from Russia, and I believe by a cargo of cattle called the Retel cattle which arrived at Hull.

1124. How would you propose to regulate the importation of live stock from foreign countries under the existing condition of things, in which cattle plague has been supposed to be almost indigenous in Russia, and in which also the transit exposes us to the possibility of its being introduced into this country from that source?—To protect ourselves against cattle plague, I think is exceedingly difficult under any circumstances; I do not think that even if all the German cattle were killed on the other side of the water, it would give ample security to us against it, though it would undoubtedly reduce the danger to a minimum; and if that be so, then certainly if we killed all the German cattle upon this side of the water, we should still be liable to the introduction of the disease as we have

Professor *Simonds.*

17 May 1877.

Chairman—continued.

have been on this occasion, although German cattle are scheduled.

1125. You mean that on account of the difficulty of ascertaining when the disease breaks out abroad, and the probability that some of the cattle are already on their voyage to this country from those parts, it is excessively difficult to prevent the import of the disease?—Exceedingly difficult. Cattle plague belongs to Russia and it not unfrequently makes its way from Russia into Eastern Prussia, or you may say into all those countries which border immediately upon Russia. It belongs no more to those countries than it belongs to us; it is always imported from Russia into them. Take Galicia, Wallachia, and Moldavia, as directly bordering upon Russia, they are quite free from cattle plague themselves, except when it is introduced by cattle coming from the valleys of the Dnieper, the Dniester, the Bug, and the Lower Danube.

1126. That district is practically the home of the disease?—That is the home of the cattle plague.

1127. And I suppose that the danger to our country is more due to the fact, that as other countries are becoming large consumers of meat, the supplies are drawn nearer to the home of the disease than they used to be?—That is one source of danger. Another source of danger is the intersection of all those countries now by railways, which have direct communication with all the railways, it may be said, in central Europe, and, of course, with those on to the western coast.

1128. Multiplying in that way the difficulties of at all preventing diseased cattle being introduced here?—Just so.

1129. Do you think that any regulations could be framed which would do away with that danger, or do you believe that the absolute prohibition of live stock coming into this country is the only mode of preventing the introduction of cattle plague?—Absolute prohibition of the importation of cattle might not of itself be sufficient; that is to say, from Germany, and Belgium which is a transit country, because it is quite possible that even sheep might bring it in.

1130. As a fact, it has not been introduced by sheep at any time, has it?—It has not been introduced by sheep at any time, but sheep are liable to the disease, and it is well known that, even supposing that they were not liable to the disease, like men or any other animal, they could communicate the disease, having come in contact with animals which were infected with it.

1131. You think it is possible that sheep would carry the disease for a considerable time, and communicate it, after being landed in this country, to cattle?—I think it is quite possible that sheep might be exposed on the other side of the water to cattle plague, and that although they themselves might not take it, they might bring it into this country.

1132. All that rather tends to show that, in your opinion, even the absolute prohibition of the introduction of cattle would not be an absolute safeguard against the introduction of the disease?—It does.

1133. Have you considered the question of quarantine as affecting the prevention of the disease?—I imagine that quarantine would never be attempted in this country with fat stock. All fat stock arriving here would be slaughtered very shortly after its arrival. Quarantine could only

Chairman—continued.

be established with regard to store stock coming from countries which are now unscheduled.

1134. With regard to fat stock, you see no other means of dealing with it than by slaughter at the port of landing?—Slaughter at the port of landing of course reduces the risk, and that has been carried out practically by placing Germany and Belgium and France and some other countries in the schedule.

1135. You have heard the evidence of Professor Brown; do you agree with him that you should prohibit the import of cattle from Germany and Belgium, because they are the principal transit countries of Russian cattle to this country?—Unless we could make international arrangements with Germany so that Germany would keep her frontier closed against the introduction of cattle from Russia, and would also give us information if she knew of the disease even approaching her frontier, I think we really must have recourse to excluding German cattle from England.

1136. I believe that it has been attempted on several occasions, has it not, to bring about such an international arrangement with Germany?—I believe it has.

1137. And it was found not to be practicable?—I believe that that is so.

1138. And the result has been that on this occasion it has been introduced through those sources?—Yes; but I look upon its introduction on this occasion as special and peculiar, because it is contrary to what has hitherto taken place with regard to cattle plague from Russia. It was brought by dealers directly across the country to Berlin, and then on to Hamburg. I look upon its recent introduction here as rather an exceptional case.

1139. Do you mean that that is not so likely to occur again as to induce the necessity of taking special precautions against it?—I think that it is not likely to occur again; the cattle traffic at the present time has altered considerably in consequence of the war between Russia and Turkey.

1140. But that alteration had not taken place when this outbreak of disease occurred?—No; but the Russian troops were mobilised on the Pruth, and contiguous districts, and it is just possible that that might have called for a larger supply for the commissariat, and consequently afforded facility for dealers getting hold of animals which were affected with cattle plague.

1141. Bearing out the evidence which was given before the last Committee, that when Russian armies moved, the cattle plague moved with them?—Just so. I believe at the present time the Russian soldiers are eating a considerable amount of cattle-plague meat.

1142. Do you agree with the evidence of Professor Brown, that the cattle plague in Russia is not the fatal disease that it is when it is imported into our climate?—Yes, that is so; and it arises, I think, from a variety of causes. First, we may say that they have hardier animals perhaps in the parts of Russia to which I have alluded than we have in England, and they bear up against disease better. Then there is another cause, which was brought to light here in 1865–67, during the time that the cattle plague prevailed, which was this, that in the case of cows that are pregnant, presuming that they carry their calves to the full length of time, the cow taking the disease

Chairman—continued.

disease during her pregnancy, the calf which she drops is insusceptible of the affection. Then when we come to look at the enormous quantity of cattle that are bred in the steppes, we can clearly enough see that the cause named is in operation to give security to a very large number of them.

1143. Have you any record of the per-centage of those cows which die, having got the disease when they are pregnant?—No; there is no separate record, but we know of several instances which occurred in this country of animals which did not die when they had the cattle plague, and which were pregnant. There was one notable instance in Islington, and I saw the calf afterwards, and that calf was exposed again and again to cattle plague, and did not take it. There was another similar case, if I recollect rightly, in Yorkshire. There would be a much larger number of animals that would recover in Russia, in consequence of their hardiness, than would recover here with our more delicate breeds, and therefore those cases would multiply considerably there.

1144. That accounts for their not taking the precautions in Russia against the disease which are supposed to be necessary in this country?—I do not think that they could in those countries take the precautions which are absolutely necessary to get rid of the affection.

1145. Turning to the question of some international arrangement, I suppose what you would suggest is, that if Germany could be persuaded to adopt such regulations as I believe Denmark has adopted with regard to the import of cattle, she would be as safe to this country as Denmark is?—I do not know that she would be as safe as Denmark is, because the disease has very rarely reached Denmark. If my recollection served me right, it has not done so for the last 100 years.

1146. But in your opinion would the same regulations give sufficient security?—Yes, and then I think we might introduce cattle from Germany, but of course keep Germany in the schedule as we do now.

1147. But unless such regulations could be enforced you believe that Professor Brown's suggestion of prohibiting the import from Germany and Belgium as transit countries, is the only practical method to give us security against the disease?—I fully coincide in that opinion.

1148. With regard to the store stock imported from the continent, there is not a very large importation of store stock, is there?—There is not a very large importation, but still it is an importation of some importance, particularly into the northern ports, Leith and Granton, and others, from Norway, Sweden, and Denmark.

1149. Is there much import of store animals into this country, beyond the Dutch import into London for dairy purposes?—No, except in certain seasons when they cannot feed their cattle, in consequenc of a drought for example in Holland; then we have often a large number of store animals sent here, animals about a year to a year and a half old; but there is a constant supply, that is to say during this season of the year, particularly, of fat calves from Holland to London.

1150. Is that the consequence of our own breeding stock not being sufficient for the pasturage of the country?—It is because there is a great demand for veal which is sent in from Holland.

Chairman—continued.

1151. I understood you to say that you were dealing with the store animals as imported, but now you say that there is great demand for veal from Holland, which means for slaughter and not for store purposes. What I meant by my question was, whether you think that there is any great amount of pasturage which is not required for the home stock into which there is a necessity of introducing store stock from the continent?—There is to some extent, but it very much depends not upon the acreage but upon the yield. In some seasons a farmer can feed about a fourth as many cattle again on his pastures as he can at another season.

1152. Therefore it is not a direct constant trade, but it is only a varying trade, according to the season and the amount of grass that there is to consume?—That is so with Holland certainly, but there is a constant trade going on, I believe, between Denmark and Sweden and Scotland.

1153. Can you give the total amount of store cattle introduced into the country?—No, I do not think that the importations of store cattle have ever been separated from the fat.

1154. With regard to the importation from Ireland, have you considered the question whether the present regulations are sufficient for dealing with the disease there?—No.

1155. It has been stated that a good deal of both pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease is introduced from Ireland; do you concur in that opinion?—I have no doubt that foot-and-mouth disease is very frequently introduced into England from Ireland, and also that occasionally pleuro-pneumonia is introduced from Ireland into England.

1156. Do you agree with Professor Brown that you could make no regulations with regard to Ireland, unless you adopted the same regulations in this country?—Quite so.

1157. And that therefore if any fresh regulations are to be adopted in order to prevent the introduction of those diseases from Ireland, they must be accompanied by a scheme such as he proposes for attempting the eradication of the disease in this country also?—The two things are necessarily connected.

1158. Do you think that any such scheme as that suggested by Professor Brown, of stringent regulations dealing with the home trade of the country, would effectually stamp out pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease?—It would take some time to stamp out both pleuro-pneumonia and also foot-and-mouth disease; though I think that in course of time those diseases might be extirpated; but in order to do it, the regulations must be carried out very stringently indeed.

1159. Are you of opinion that regulations as strict as those must be, would be submitted to by the people in this country, if they have in view the object of stamping out the disease entirely?—I do not think they would.

1160. With regard to the trade in dead meat, has your attention been at all directed to this fresh trade which has sprung up from America?—Not specially so. I only know of it from reading and hearing about it.

1161. Do you think that the trade will be a possible one as supplying the food of the country?

Professor *Simonds.*

17 May 1877.

Chairman—continued.

—I have doubt with regard to the trade as to whether it is likely to be continued during the summer months especially, notwithstanding what has been stated with regard to the imports of meat during the summer and during the hottest weather. I think it is well known that even this winter very many cargoes of meat have arrived from America in a state nearly unfit for food. I believe that American meat which has been introduced into Liverpool, immediately upon being debarked has been sold at a very fair and remunerative price; and that part of the same cargo has been sold for a very much diminished price.

1162. In the same place?—In the same place, and when sent on also to other towns.

1163. I suppose the trade at present may be said to be in its infancy; of course, if you depend for the freshness of your meat upon its being kept in the same temperature, as soon as it has been landed at the port and removed from that temperature, its journey will deteriorate it; and therefore, although it may be perfectly fresh in Liverpool, it would not be delivered fresh in London unless it were carried on under the same conditions of transit?—Just so; that would be absolutely necessary, I imagine, in order to have the meat delivered in London in a condition fit for consumption.

1164. Are you aware whether those conditions have been carried out with regard to that quantity of meat which you describe as being condemned in London, or had it been landed at Liverpool and then sent by rail to the London markets, without the conditions of temperature under which it was brought over having been continued?—I am not aware.

1165. That would make an important difference of course?—It would, necessarily.

1166. And that might account for that quantity of meat being condemned, as you state, in the market?—Just so.

1167. I understand you to suggest, as Professor Brown did, that the importation of live animals from Germany and Belgium should be prohibited; have you considered the question of whether, under those circumstances, looking to the fact that we now receive from those countries about 60,000 beasts, a dead meat trade would take the place of that live import?—I think decidedly not.

1168. Could you give the Committee your reasons for saying that you think that dead meat would not come in to supply the place of the live cattle so prohibited?—Dead meat, if brought in, must be sold, and the price is liable to very great fluctuation, and it would very frequently, indeed, arrive here, even with the greatest possible care, in a condition not fit to be consumed. I think also that a great demand would spring up for the live cattle being sent to other countries, say to France, for example; live cattle can always be sold at a greater price than dead meat can be sold at.

1169. Practically it would result in this: that although at first no trade would come here at all, but would go to France, after a time the glut in France, from the double trade being there, would so reduce the price there as to bring the prices in England in favourable competition with it, and so re-introduce the trade here?—That might be so.

1170. The danger seems to be then in the first stoppage of the existing trade until the markets have regulated themselves, and the prices have brought a dead meat trade into existence?—Yes.

1171. Would you give the Committee a summary of what you yourself would recommend for dealing with these diseases in the country?—I should keep up pretty well the system that now exists, and keep certain countries in the schedule, and certain other countries as unscheduled. The countries that should be unscheduled, I imagine, are Norway, Sweeden, Denmark, Spain, Portugal, America, Canada, and the Channel Islands; and I should keep in the schedule until we could have security given, say by the Government, to guard against the introduction of disease, France, Germany, Belgium, Wurtemburg, and Bavaria, the latter being in direct communication with Austria. If France could close her frontier against the introduction of animals likely to be affected with cattle plague, I should put France among the unscheduled countries, and allow importation from her; but so long as the present state of things exist it will be necessary to keep France, Belgium, and Germany, in the schedule.

1172. Those are the countries from which you suggest that no import should take place?—Yes, no import should take place, I imagine, from Germany through Belgium; and I would exclude animals coming from France at the present time.

1173. How would you propose to deal with Schleswig-Holstein?—I should allow the animals to come from Schleswig-Holstein as they do now under special regulations. I believe something like 50,000 are sent here during the latter part of the year, from June to November, and as cattle plague has not existed in those countries, we do not therefore run any risk. I should allow those animals to come in and to be freely dealt with, and to go where they pleased.

1174. You would allow them to circulate freely?—I should.

1175. Would you attach to that any conditions as to inspection, or otherwise?—Yes, inspection and detention at the port of landing; and that detention should be certainly in all cases not less than 24 hours.

1176. Would that in your opinion be sufficiently long to guarantee you against an outbreak of cattle plague amongst those animals?—It would depend entirely upon circumstances. If, for example, a person were to select animals that had been exposed to cattle plague, and put them on board vessels and send them here, as from Tonning (taking an imaginary case altogether), looking at the period of time which the voyage occupies with the period of detention, 24 hours, that would not be sufficient. Against foot and mouth disease I consider that it would be sufficient.

1177. You stated that you thought you might allow cattle from Schleswig-Holstein to be introduced here under certain regulations, and that then they might circulate freely through the country; do you think that, as against cattle plague, 24 hours' detention is sufficient to guarantee you against the latent disease?—No. Of course we should be obliged to place Schleswig Holstein in the schedule, or prevent importation from there in the event of cattle plague extending.

1178. The whole of the evidence that Professor Brown has given went to show that our difficulty

Chairman—continued.

difficulty arose from the want of information, and that the cattle plague arrived here almost as soon as, or before, the information of the breaking out of the disease in the country from which the cattle came; might not that be possible with respect to Schleswig-Holstein, and would you not, therefore, be liable to the same introduction of cattle plague from there under the scheme that you have suggested, as you suffer now from Germany?—So many precautions are taken with regard to the introduction of disease from Germany we may say into Schleswig-Holstein (although Schleswig-Holstein now constitute a part of the German Empire) that I think there would be very little risk of the cattle plague extending into Schleswig-Holstein. We had the disease sent here from Hamburg and it has been in Hamburg once or twice. It was in Hamburg in 1872, but it did not extend to Schleswig-Holstein.

1179. Do you think that the precautions are sufficient to protect them against the Hamburg trade?—I think so.

1180. You say that you would admit animals under certain regulations and inspection; are there any regulations that you would suggest as to disinfection of ships?—With regard to the ships, I think that it would be a prudent measure that all ships which bring cattle should be disinfected, and I quite agree with the evidence that we ought to bring cattle into this country only in cattle ships, and not in ships which, besides bringing cattle, bring other cargo.

1181. You agree with that upon the ground that you are able to deal with it more effectually by disinfecting the ship?—Just so, and I think that the ship should be detained until we had ascertained whether the animals were or were not free from disease.

1182. You think that the ship should not be allowed to go without being disinfected if there was any suspicion of disease being brought in?—Certainly not, we should have power over her until we had satisfied ourselves that the animals that the ship brought were free from disease.

1183. Can you give the Committee any idea of the losses to the country at the time that you were engaged in the department in dealing with the cattle plague in 1865-67?—The losses amounted, I think, to about one-third of a million of animals from cattle plague in this country from 1865 to 1867.

1184. That would, as Professor Brown has stated, represent about 4,000,000 *l.* or 5,000,000 *l.*?—It would.

1185. Do you agree with him that it would not be possible that such a calamity should occur again in this country under the precautions that are now taken?—I think that it is quite impossible, with our present regulations ever to have anything like a repetition of what took place in 1865-67.

1186. Do you know what the losses in the outbreak of 1872 were?—They were not very many; the losses that took place were chiefly in Yorkshire.

1187. At that time there was no such loss as took place on the first occasion, was there?—The loss was very slight indeed which took place in 1872, and, as I have already stated, it took place only in the East Riding of Yorkshire; we had on that occasion no less than seven imports of the disease, and all between the 17th of July and the 29th of July. The first import was on the 17th of July of Russian cattle into London; the second was into Hartlepool on the 21st of July, a mixed cargo; the third was into Leith on the 22nd of July of Russian cattle; the fourth was into Newcastle on the same day, a mixed cargo; the fifth was into Hull on the 25th of July of Russian cattle; the sixth was into Hartlepool of German cattle; and the seventh into Newcastle, on the 29th, of German cattle. The first import was from Cronstadt, direct to London; the second was from Hamburg; the third from Cronstadt; the fourth from Hamburg; the fifth from Cronstadt; and the others from Hamburg.

Chairman—continued.

1188. That led to the stoppage of the Russian trade, did it not?—That led to the stoppage of the Russian trade. The disease did not escape from London, or Hartlepool, or Leith, or Newcastle, but only from Hull.

1189. On that occasion, as on the present occasion, it was shown that regulations do materially diminish the risk to the country, was it not?—Certainly.

1190. Whilst you consider that the existing regulations are in a great measure sufficient to deal with cattle plague, which is the worst complaint, you agree with Professor Brown that, with respect to Germany and Belgium, the trade ought to be prohibited if you wish to ensure the extinction of cattle plague here?—I do.

1191. But you could leave the other countries scheduled, and unscheduled countries, as you have described?—Yes.

Mr. *Arthur Peel.*

1192. The outbreak in 1872 was a very slight outbreak as compared with that of 1865-67; what were the regulations in force at the time of the outbreak in 1872 as compared with the regulations that are now in force; has there been any increased stringency in the regulations since?—I am not aware that there has been any increased stringency; the same regulations were in force in 1872 as are in force now.

1193. Do you argue from that that no increase of stringency is necessary?—Only with regard to the greater danger that we are running now, and have been year by year, in consequence of the greater facilities that are given for the movement of cattle from Russia into Germany.

1194. The facilities being greater, you think that increased stringency ought to follow?—Yes; some years since I went into Galicia for the purpose of studying cattle plague, at the request of the Royal Agricultural Society and the National Societies of Scotland and Ireland. At that time there were no railways beyond Lemburg, and Prussia (as then existing) was enabled to know when cattle plague was approaching her frontier, and would take measures to prevent cattle plague entering her territory; or suppose that cattle plague had made its way into Poland, Prussia would have information of it, and she would prevent the passage of animals over the frontier; but now, in consequence of the introduction of railways, there being three or four railways going from Germany into Russia, those barriers are broken down, and Germany does not herself get the information early enough.

1195. I did not quite understand the conditions which you said you thought ought to attach to a country, being a scheduled country; you

Professor *Simonds.*

17 May 1877.

Mr. *Arthur Peel*—continued.

would stop the importation of live meat, of course; would you stop the importation of dead meat, or would you be satisfied with slaughter at the port of arrival?—I should not stop the importation of dead meat from countries from which we have stopped the importation of live cattle.

1196. Not even if cattle plague was raging in those countries?—No; although it is quite true that meat will carry the disease, it would depend entirely upon the extent and the situation of the cattle plague in Germany as to whether we stopped the dead meat trade or not; Germany deals very summarily with the cattle plague, and will pretty soon stamp it out; there would be a risk supposing cattle plague were in the western part of Germany, but not much, I think, so far as dead meat is concerned, if it existed in the eastern part.

1197. Assuming the existence of cattle plague in a foreign part from which cattle came, say Hamburg, would it be a sufficient precaution in this country to slaughter the cattle at the port of arrival, coming from the infected port?—It would be hardly sufficient, I think, while the cattle plague existed.

1198. Not even with any precautions which you might establish at the port of arrival?—No.

1199. You mentioned, I think, that calves were insusceptible of disease when born from a mother which had the disease at the time of pregnancy?—That has been our experience.

1200. Is it possible to argue from that that inoculation would prevent the disease?—Inoculation on the contrary has been found to be exceedingly destructive in cattle plague. There have been many experiments in different parts of the Russian Empire, but they were soon abandoned in consequence of the great fatality that attended them. It was not found, as is generally the case, that the inoculated disease was milder than the natural disease.

1201. Is there any scientific explanation of the fact of the immunity of calves so born?—Merely that the system of the calf has been brought under the influence of the blood-poisoning or the specific virus of the disease while *in utero*, and that has guarded it against disease afterwards.

1202. But that is not the principle of inoculation?—That is not the principle of inoculation.

Colonel *Kingscote.*

1203. Did you go to Russia yourself?—No, I went to Gallicia.

1204. You do not know what rules or regulations the Russian Government make when cattle plague breaks out; do they make any?—They make very few rules indeed. They scarcely intercept the traffic, because Russia has to feed herself from the steppes, and there are something like 6,000,000 cattle, I believe, raised annually in the steppes, which are exported from the steppes to other parts of Russia, and they are or used to be, until barriers were put in the way, also exported to Germany and other countries.

Major *Allen.*

1205. You say that calves when born of mothers suffering from cattle plague are free from cattle plague, or at least they are likely to be free from cattle plague?—Yes.

1206. If that is so, how is it that in Russia where there must be a large number of those calves, the cattle plague does not decrease?—

Major *Allen*—continued.

I believe it to be one of the causes in operation to save a large number of animals in the steppes from the disease, and consequently to save a large number of lives. My opinion is, if I put it strongly, that if we could transport our cattle to the steppes of Russia, and let them be there exposed to cattle plague, we should in all probability lose from 80 to 90 per cent. of them; while not more of the animals die in Russia from the disease than 30 or 40 per cent.

Colonel *Kingscote.*

1207. Have you not heard it stated as a fact that when the disease breaks out in Russia, in some places, I do not say always, they rather let it burn itself out and let the whole of the cattle die, and then they say they are free from it?—I have heard of statements of that kind, but I have not much confidence in those statements.

1208. I distinctly understand you to give it as your opinion, and especially after the last outbreak of cattle plague at Deptford, that slaughter at the port of debarcation does not give sufficient immunity from cattle plague?—It is shown distinctly that that system has broken down when cattle plague has come direct from the port where it exists, as it did here from Hamburg to Deptford.

1209. When you were at the head of the Veterinary Department of the Privy Council, you gave us the times of the importation of cattle disease from Russia and Hamburg; Russia was scheduled, and Hamburg was not scheduled, was it?—Yes; Hamburg was scheduled, I think, at that time; the importation from Russia was prohibited afterwards.

1210. Why should not the importation from Hamburg have been prohibited as well as the importation from Russia, if they were equally dangerous sources of infection?—The prohibition of animals from a single place has not been found to answer. I remember perfectly well with regard to the sheep-pox, some years ago, that a number of animals were sent from Hamburg to England, or rather were attempted to be sent, and the shipping agents refused to bring them. When that was found to be the case, those animals were put upon the railway, and they were sent into England *viâ* France. I am afraid that if we scheduled Hamburg only, we should find those things continually going on.

1211. As it seemed to me that the disease in 1872 came equally from Cronstadt and Hamburg, I did not understand why Russia was scheduled and not Hamburg; can you give me any reason for it?—I cannot charge my mind just now as to whether Hamburg was scheduled at that time; I mean as part of Germany.

1212. Can you give me any positive reason?—I cannot at this moment charge my mind as to whether it was so or not.

1213. Do you consider it a step in the right direction that the Privy Council should supersede the local authority when the cattle plague breaks out as it did in Middlesex, and in the Metropolitan district?—Yes; I think that wherever cattle plague breaks out in England the Privy Council should supersede the local authority.

1214. Not because the local authority does not do its best, but because the Privy Council is better able to draw a cordon round the place?—Yes, and to carry out all the regulations which are necessary for disinfection, and so on, in a better

Colonel *Kingscote*—continued.

better manner than they could possibly be carried out by the local authority.

1215. And then there was no clashing of the boundaries of the different local authorities?—No.

Mr. *Chamberlain.*

1216. You do not suggest that any alterations are desirable in the regulations with respect to pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease, do you?—Not unless we are determined to do our utmost to free the country of these affections. If so the regulations with regard to foot-and-mouth disease must be the same practically as those with regard to cattle plague, with the exception of killing the animals. Places must be declared infected, all movement must be stopped, and fairs and markets, and so on, suppressed.

1217. But you agree with Professor Brown, do you not, that those regulations would be so unpopular as to be almost unworkable?—I quite agree with him in that respect.

1218. Do you know what proportion of the total import of live cattle is attributable to countries which you propose should be scheduled with regard to cattle plague?—From Belgium the number of cattle imported in 1876 was 6,704.

1219. The countries which you suggest should be scheduled are Russia and Germany, are they not?—Belgium should be scheduled; Canada free; Denmark free; France scheduled; Germany scheduled; The Netherlands scheduled, unless special arrangements are made that she would close her ports if necessary; Norway free; Spain free; Portugal free; Sweden free; the United States of America free; and the Channel Islands free.

1220. Then, including the Netherlands, the places which you would schedule appears to have sent about 170,000 out of a total of 274,000 head of cattle received from those foreign countries; would not the result of putting those countries in the schedule be considerably to effect the price of meat?—They are in the schedule, and they have been in the schedule for some time.

1221. What alteration is it you suggest?—I propose no alteration in the present system with the exception of guarding against the introduction of cattle plague from Germany *viâ* Belgium.

1222. By excluding cattle coming from Germany and Belgium?—Yes.

1223. Do you consider that their exclusion would materally affect the price of meat?—No, I do not think it would.

1224. Do you know from what source the Privy Council Office has generally derived the first information as to an outbreak of cattle disease in any of the English farms; has it derived it from the owner or from its own officials, or from other sources?—There are no officials of the Privy Council Office, save and except at the ports. The inspectors throughout the country are appointed by the local authority.

1225. Has the information generally come from them or from the owner?—That is a question I cannot answer. It is an official matter with regard to the present system which prevails.

Sir *George Jenkinson.*

1226. I think you said that prohibiting the importation of live stock would not attain absolute safety; is not your opinion that it would

Sir *George Jenkinson*—continued.

diminish the risk to a minimum?—It would reduce the risk, undoubtedly, to a minimum.

1227. Do you see any great reason against such prohibition; would it in the long run be likely to affect injuriously the price of meat to consumers, that is allowing both for the development of dead meat importation, and also for the diminished risk to our stock?—With regard to our loss here, I do not think that it can be at all ascertained what it is; nor do I think that it is attributable to the disease which is imported. I am speaking now, of course, specially with regard to foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia.

1228. I had cattle plague in my mind, chiefly in my question?—Cattle plague is undoubtedly invariably introduced into the country, and all the losses arising from cattle plague arise from such introduction.

1229. Then, do you think that if the importation of foreign live stock was prohibited, it would injuriously affect the price of meat to the consumer by raising it unduly above what it is now; that is to say, if you simply excluded the meat from countries where cattle plague has ever existed?—I should not exclude it from countries where cattle plague has ever existed; I should simply exclude it from those countries which are liable to have the cattle plague at any time. The only countries which are liable to have the cattle plague at any time would be Germany and others bordering on Russia; animals from Russia have been excluded for some time; it would be animals that would be brought from Russia into Germany that would be dangerous to us.

1230. But as a matter of fact, they are prohibited from Germany, are they not?—They are prohibited from Germany at this time.

1231. And the price of meat has not risen?—It has not, but then prohibition has only been in operation since the introduction of cattle plague on this last occcasion.

1232. Have you seen this Return which was issued yesterday on my motion (*handing a Return to the Witness*)?—I have not seen it.

1233. That return shows that in the last outbreak we lost 1,083 dairy cows, does it not?—I anticipate that we have lost something like that number.

1234. And that represents a loss which would be saved if we did not import the disease?—Certainly.

1235. Would not the enforced slaughter of imported cattle at the port of embarcation be some compensation for the loss of imported live stock; that is to say, would not much of the stock that now comes in alive, come in the form of dead meat?—I am not at all in favour of killing the animals on the other side of the water, and sending in the meat; I do not think that that would give us very much security or not a sufficient security. My opinion (though perhaps I am rather singular in that) is this: that if meat were killed on the other side of the water, we should have all kinds of animals sent to the abattoirs there, and sent in here as dead meat, and then I think we should run a very grave risk from time to time of introducing cattle plague by meat.

1236. But that is not the case with regard to the present importation trade of dead meat from America, is it?—There is no cattle plague in America; there is no disease in America that is

Professor *Simonds.*

17 May 1877.

Professor *Simonds.*

17 May 1877.

Sir *George Jenkinson*—continued.

known to be a fatal cattle disease, except the Texas fever, which has been alluded to this morning by Professor Brown.

1237. But the danger of infection of cattle plague from dead meat would be infinitely less than from the importation of any number of live stock, would it not?—Certainly.

1238. Then, so far, it would be a gain to slaughter at the port of embarcation rather than to import the live stock?—So far as that goes it would.

1239. I think that quarantine is practised at Southampton, is it not?—It is practised at Southampton with regard to animals coming from the Channel Islands, and with regard to them only, I think, but I am not certain on that point.

1240. My reason for asking was that I have heard it alleged that if quarantine were established, it would create a hotbed of disease; that is not the case at Southampton, is it?—They are not parallel cases; if we had quarantine established with regard to animals coming from abroad, we should certainly have a focus of disease which we should never get rid of; we should spread the disease all over the country. If we wanted to propagate disease all over England I do not know of a better plan of doing it than by establishing quarantine stations.

1241. Do you not think that quarantine being established at any port would tend to prevent people from sending diseased stock to that port?—I do not think it would.

1242. They would send it at a certain loss, would they not?—They would send stock notwithstanding the establishment of a quarantine station.

1243. But that is not practically the result at Southampton, is it?—There is no disease existing in the Channel Islands that has to be guarded against beyond the foot-and-mouth disease.

1244. I think that it applies to cattle from France also, does it not. I know one case where an English cow came from France that had been sent to France from this country, and she was returned, and she was not admitted into London, but had to go round to Southampton?—I do not know what the regulations are. We prohibit animals at the present time from France, and consequently I do not see how animals could be brought from France to Southampton and put in quarantine.

Mr. *Jacob Bright.*

1245. You consider, so far as I remember what you have said, that a trade in dead meat would never be so profitable as a trade in live animals, where the distance did not prevent a trade in live animals?—No, I think that the live animal trade is to be preferred to the dead meat trade.

1246. You think that in the case of a dead meat trade they never could be certain about the price which they would obtain?—That is so.

1247. They might have a great deal of dead meat that would sell at very low prices from the fact that it would not keep; live animals will keep and dead meat will not?—Yes.

1248. If the dead meat trade would be less profitable than the live animal trade on that account, of course there would be less trade in food with dead meat than with live animals?—It is likely to be so.

1249. Because whenever the profits are the best, the trade becomes the largest?—Yes.

1250. With regard to the United States, if

Mr. *Jacob Bright*—continued.

they were as near to us as Denmark is, you would not have a dead meat trade from them?—Not for those reasons.

1251. They would be sure to send us the live animals?—They would be sure to send us the live animals.

1252. I understand that you do not ask for any increase to the stringent regulations which already exist with regard to diseases other than cattle plague?—No, not any, unless we here are desirous of stamping out the diseases which have existed from the time which I have mentioned.

1253. Unless there could be complete co-operation?—Unless there could be complete co-operation.

1254. The restrictions are already very severe with regard to those diseases, are they not?—They are sufficiently severe to protect us fairly from the introduction of the disease into the country.

1255. That is to say, if a single animal, no matter of what kind, had foot-and-mouth disease, or pleuro-pneumonia, and you have a very large cargo, the whole cargo is slaughtered at the port of debarcation?—It is.

1256. Do you not consider that a very severe restriction?—It is a severe restriction, but it is not more severe than is necessary, because the animals that have been exposed to the disease on the voyage would communicate the disease to our animals, presuming that they were allowed to go from the port of debarcation alive.

1257. But you have no desire whatever to add to those restrictions unless by the co-operation of which you speak?—No, I have not.

1258. With regard to the restrictions on the cattle trade, the money losses in the present cattle plague amount to about 15,000 *l.*, do they not?—Yes.

1259. You have said that the loss in 1872 was very slight; do you mean that it was less than 15,000 *l.*?—I should think that it was considerably less than 15,000 *l.*; I have no positive information as to what the losses were in 1872, because I was not then in the office. I simply know the broad fact that there were a few places in the East Riding of Yorkshire that were affected with the cattle plague which had spread to the East Riding from the Hull cargo. I think the losses were very small.

1260. In that case, then, our regulations or means of detecting and of stamping out the disease are so perfect that for 10 years our money losses have probably not exceeded 20,000 *l.* with regard to cattle plague?—Yes, possibly that is so.

1261. You do not look to anything like perfection in human affairs, do you?—Certainly not.

1262. You do not suppose that farming, any more than any other trade in the country, can be carried on absolutely without risk?—Certainly not.

1263. And if they have reduced that risk to a loss of 20,000 *l.* in 10 years, the success of the present system must be admitted to be considerable?—Very considerable when we come to compare the condition that we are in now with our regulations, with the condition that we were in in 1865, when we had no regulations at all.

1264. And with that very great success might it not be a question whether it was wise to alter the system altogether, or even to make it more stringent?

Mr. *Jacob Bright*—continued.

stringent?—I imagine that that is the question which this Committee is inquiring into.

1265. I ask your opinion upon that question, whether it might not be wise to let well alone?—I am very much of the opinion that it would be perhaps as well to let well alone.

1266. With regard to Germany, you do not propose to put Germany in the schedule, but you propose to prohibit everything that comes from Germany as we are doing now, I think?—Yes, that is the most effective means, I should imagine, of dealing with cattle plague as being imported into this country from Germany.

1267. Germany is now a prohibited country, is it not?—Germany is a prohibited country.

1268. And you propose that it should remain so?—I propose that it should remain so in the event of any change being made in our present system.

1269. You propose, do you not, that Germany should continue a prohibited country in any case?—I cannot say that I do. I think that when the danger is passed we might put Germany back into the schedule, but if any steps are taken beyond those now in existence to protect us against cattle plague, I imagine that the only thing which we could do would be to prohibit the import of animals from Germany.

1270. When was Germany prohibited?—Upon the introduction of cattle plague within the last few months.

1271. Before that was Germany scheduled, or unscheduled?—Scheduled.

1272. For how long had it been so?—For some years; ever since the alteration was made with regard to the division of foreign countries into scheduled and unscheduled countries.

1273. Then Germany was a scheduled country for some years without any case of cattle plague?—Yes.

1274. And, of course, it was a great advantage to us to get from Germany those 60,000 head of cattle, or thereabouts, that we had?—A great advantage.

1275. But I thought you said that the exclusion of that great amount of cattle did not affect the price of meat?—It is found that the price of meat has not yet been affected by the prohibition of the importation of animals from Germany, but the prohibition has been in operation only for a short time.

1276. Then ought you not on ordinary commercial principles to conclude from that that seeing that the price of meat has not varied, although that meat has been excluded, if that meat had been allowed still to come in, the price would have fallen?—The meat trade is one which it is very difficult to comprehend; it does not appear to be governed by precisely the same laws of supply and demand that other trades are. I am very much of opinion with Professor Brown that the labouring classes of this country, earning a good deal of money, will have even more meat than they really require, and that, on the contrary, when they earn very little money there is very little consumption of meat.

1277. Still, if there be any trade in the country, the prices of which are not affected by the exclusion of a considerable amount of supply, there must be something rather miraculous about it, must there not?—There is something which I have never yet been able to understand with regard to the difference between the wholesale price of meat and the retail price.

Mr. *Jacob Bright*—continued.

1278. With regard to Schleswig-Holstein, is that a scheduled country?—As part of Germany it is a scheduled country, or was so when Germany was in the schedule; but no animals will arrive from Schleswig-Holstein until about the month of June.

1279. In what position is Schleswig-Holstein now?—As part of Germany it is a prohibited country.

1280. Is it a non-transit country?—Yes, it is a non-transit country.

1281. Are not the cattle and sheep exclusively home-grazed there?—The cattle that are fed in Schleswig come chiefly from out of Denmark.

1282. Have we any reason to suppose that there is any connection between Schleswig and any country where the disease exists?—No; the cattle traffic is in the opposite direction from Denmark, into Mecklenburg.

1283. Is there any reason why we should not have free trade in cattle between Schleswig-Holstein and this country in cattle?—As an act of prudence, and knowing that Hamburg is so near to Schleswig-Holstein, I think it is better that Schleswig-Holstein should be dealt with as part of the German Empire, and that Germany being free from cattle plague, arrangements identical with those now in existence should be in operation to allow animals to come from Schleswig-Holstein here from June to November.

1284. Has there ever been a case of cattle plague in Schleswig-Holstein?—Yes, 100 years ago.

1285. But not in this century?—Not in this century that I know of.

1286. Does it not seem hard that we should be shut out from Schleswig-Holstein?—Recent arrangements did not shut us out from Schleswig-Holstein, and presuming that she was an unscheduled country altogether, she would export no animals but home bred ones; her animals are grass-fed animals.

1287. With regard to Holland, what is the position?—Holland is at this time a scheduled country.

1288. Is there any reason for that?—The cattle plague was very near her frontier, and it was considered that great risk was being run by allowing animals to come in from Holland as an unscheduled country; Holland consequently became a scheduled country.

1289. Has there been cattle plague of late years in Holland?—Yes, there was a considerable amount in 1865 and 1866.

1290. Has there been any since?—Since 1866 I do not think that Holland has suffered from cattle plague.

1291. Then if so long a period has elapsed since Holland suffered from cattle plague, and if Schleswig-Holstein has had no cattle plague during this century, would it not seem reasonable that they should be free?—I think that Holland is in too direct communication with Germany to allow of her being free.

Mr. *Assheton*.

1292. We have had one or two rather general propositions; I presume you will admit that loss and risk are not convertible terms?—Yes.

1293. And that though our loss from cattle plague in five years may have been only 20,000 *l.*, that does not represent our risk?—Certainly not.

1294. I forget

Professor *Simonds.*

17 May 1877.

Mr. *Assheton*—continued.

1294. I forget whether you offered any opinion as to the loss to the country by the cattle plague of 1865-66-67?—Yes, from 4,000,000 *l.* to 5,000,000 *l.*

1295. May I ask you whether in making that estimation that you estimate only the value of the cattle, or whether you also take into consideration the loss of time to the farmer, the loss through his not being able to utilize the produce of his farm, and the loss in money by his not being able to take his stock to market at the most favourable moment?—All those things are excluded from that calculation; it is a mere calculation formed upon the number of animals lost and their probable value per head.

Colonel *Kingscote.*

1296. How much is that per head?—I think about 12 *l.* per head.

Mr. *Assheton.*

1297. Were you connected with the Privy Council Department at the time of the 1865-66-67 outbreak of cattle plague?—Yes.

1298. Did you find that the farmers resisted the very stringent regulations that had to be put in force?—The farmers were exceedingly anxious to save their cattle, and to try all means of curing the disease, and the consequence was that we lost thousands of cattle which would have been spared, if we had had stringent measures which we could at once have put into operation.

1299. Does your experience on that point agree with mine, that the cattle-jobbers took a great deal more looking after than the farmers?—I can hardly say that they took a great deal more looking after. I think that a great many of the farmers, particularly in Cheshire, required a great deal of looking after.

1300. May I ask you whether you think that it is of the slightest use to inquire as to cures for cattle plague?—I do not think it is of any use.

1301. Are you aware of any preventives that have been at all efficacious?—No preventive measures that we know of are efficacious.

1302. I daresay you remember vaccination being tried?—Quite well.

1303. What was the result of that trial?—The result was that it tended to kill more animals than otherwise would have died from the disease by giving a false security, and leading people to suppose that they had something that they could rely upon as a preventive.

1304. The honourable Member for Manchester seemed to be of opinion, and I think you also agreed with him, that there would be sometimes a great glut of dead meat in the market, if a dead-meat trade were substituted for a live-cattle trade with continental ports; might not that be obviated, in a great measure, by the use of the telegraph, saying, "Do not kill any more for a week; we have plenty of dead meat"?—Yes, there is no doubt it could be obviated, and that the trade could be regulated to some extent by such means; but I think not to a sufficient extent; because the animals must be killed, and the meat must be cold and fit for export, before it could be put on the ship to be sent here; and, therefore, you would in many instances have to telegraph two or three days before; and you cannot tell what the state of the trade will be from one market day to the other, because the trade fluctuates so much, and is so uncertain.

Mr. *Torr.*

1305. You assert that if the German import of live stock was stopped, the same quantity would not come as dead meat; do you know that of your own practical knowledge?—Not from my own practical knowledge; but I think there can be no doubt that that would be the effect; there would not be the same quantity sent.

1306. You say that dead meat could not be sent so cheaply as live cattle?—Yes, and it could not be sold at a profit so well here.

1307. Have you had any practical knowledge of that?—I have practical knowledge with regard to dead meat never fetching so much as live meat in the market.

1308. Of course you are aware that the import of dead meat is quite a novelty, and we have only had 18 months' experience of it to any great extent, and that now it is so thoroughly understood that if you get a piece of dead meat that has come from America neither you nor I could tell the difference from the finest English beef?—Yes; but I will take the case of an English farmer, and perhaps I might go so far as to take my own case. Some few years ago I had a farm in the immediate neighbourhood of London, and I used to kill animals and send them up to Smithfield market, and I found that the system was not at all remunerative; but when I kept my animals on the farm, and had a man down to look at them, and we bargained for what they were worth, I found a very different state of things; I should imagine that the same principle would apply to the dead meat trade.

1309. Is not the import of cattle, dead or alive, from abroad entirely a matter of commercial enterprise?—It is not, perhaps, so much a matter of commercial enterprise as a matter of absolute necessity; we do not rear enough animals ourselves, and we must be aided by having more sent into this country.

1310. You said, in answer to the honourable Member for Manchester, that it could not be done so cheaply; have you had any experience of the relative cost of importing animals from abroad alive and of importing the meat that would represent those animals if they were brought in a dead state?—I have no personal experience of it whatever.

1311. Are you not aware that the facilities, means, and appliances for importing meat now are as different from what they were even two or three years ago as light is from dark?—I am aware that the facilities are greater, and that the appliances are better, but they are not sufficient, I think, to meet the case.

1312. Is it not fair to infer that if the 55,000 cattle were prohibited from coming from Germany and Belgium, a very large proportion of those animals would come in the shape of dead meat?—A large proportion would come, no doubt, as dead meat; but I believe, as I have already stated, that we should not have anything like the same amount of meat sent in as would be sent in as live animals.

1313. Then it is only an impression upon your mind, and you have no information upon the matter?—No, I have not. We should lose also hides and horns and hoofs, and things of that kind, if we had the animals killed on the other side of the water.

1314. The questions that have been asked you, I think, refer to the supply of meat to the people of

Mr. *Torr*—continued.

of this country, and the argument against stopping the imports from Germany and Belgium is, that you would thereby diminish the supply of meat for the population of this island. Your profession being that of a veterinary surgeon of very great eminence, that, I presume, is scarcely a question that you would have answered with the confidence with which a man of practical mercantile knowledge would be authorised to answer it; as you have had some experience of farming, I imagine that the first aim of all farmers is to produce the largest amount of food for the people; one farmer produces it in corn and another in meat; do you think that the exclusion even of 55,000 head of cattle from Germany and Belgium would have a greater or a less effect upon the supply of meat of this country than the exclusion of the periodical disease, which would affect the millions of animals of this country?—The introduction of the disease, I hold, does not materially increase the disease already existing in this country. We deal with diseased animals at the port, and we sacrifice the whole of them, and it is evident than when we have been introducing the largest number of diseased animals from the continent, we have had the fewest animals affected with the disease here; and it is also true that when we introduced no animals from abroad at all, foot-and-mouth disease was more, or quite as much, diffused as it ever has been since, and that our losses were equally heavy.

1315. But the point before us, upon which you have been principally questioned, is the stopping of the supply of animals from Germany to prevent the introduction of cattle plague; both you and the previous witness have said that we have foot-and-mouth disease, and that unless we adopt very stringent measures indeed at home, as well as abroad, we could not stamp it out; but so far as cattle plague is concerned, both you and the preceding witness say that we owe that cattle plague entirely to imports?—Yes, we do, entirely; and we have had no serious loss from cattle plague since 1865-67. We had one small loss from cattle plague in 1872, and we have now to add the present loss.

1316. Do you think that it would be an onerous cost to impose upon this country, if by stopping the 55,000 head of cattle from Germany and Holland we could prevent the recurrence of that cattle plague, simply looking at the question as a matter of food?—Looking at the frequency of the introduction of cattle plague, I think that it would be a serious loss.

1317. What would be a serious loss?—The stopping of those animals from Germany.

1318. Would it be at all an equivalent if by that means you could escape the recurrence of cattle plague, taking the two points together?—It is a matter upon which I am not prepared to give a decided opinion; as coming before me for the first time, I have not sufficiently considered it.

Sir *Rainald Knightley.*

1319. Did I correctly understand you to say that the dead meat was capable of communicating the cattle plague?—Undoubtedly.

1320. To cattle?—To cattle.

1321. Have you ever known a case of it?—Yes, several.

1322. And sheep also?—Yes, and sheep also.

1323. But cattle plague has never been communicated to this country, so far as you are aware, either by dead meat or by sheep?—No; it never has been imported into this country either by dead meat or by sheep, but in this country there were many cases of cattle plague which were due to animals being exposed to the flesh of animals that had been either killed or had died of cattle plague.

Sir *Rainald Knightley*—continued.

1324. But is it not very difficult to prove that the disease is communicated by dead meat; if the disease was very prevalent all over the country at the time, how could you prove that the disease was communicated by dead meat where there were live cattle at the time suffering from the disease?—I will give you one instance which occurred in the county of Essex, when the cattle plague was nearly exterminated from that county; I am not aware that at the time I allude to the cattle plague existed within 15 or 20 miles of the place. A person bought some sheep in Colchester market; those sheep had been exposed to cattle plague, but they appeared to be healthy at the time he bought them; he sent them over to his farm, within six or seven miles of Colchester, and put them into his pastures. A day or two afterwards some of the sheep were found to be ill; the ill sheep he took up on to his farm premises, not knowing what the sheep were suffering from. He had several calves upon his farm premises, and within about five or six days of bringing the unhealthy sheep on to the farm premises the calves were taken ill. The first calf which was taken ill he thought possibly might be sold for food, and sent to London, as is a common custom; and he sent for a village butcher close by. The village butcher took the calf and killed it, but after it was killed it was found to be of so bad a colour (to use their expression) that it was not saleable. It was not known at that time that the calf was affected with cattle plague. Another farmer, living in an opposite direction, went down to the village, bought part of this calf as food for his dogs, took it home and hung it up near to where his cows were; cattle plague was thus communicated to his cows and he lost them all.

1325. You imagine that the sheep gave the cattle plague to the calf?—Undoubtedly.

Chairman.

1326. I understood you, just now, to say that the rinderpest had not existed in Schleswig-Holstein during the present century?—No, not for quite 100 years, I think.

1327. Is Altona considered to be in Schleswig?—Altona is in Schleswig-Holstein, Schleswig being north, of course, of Holstein.

1328. Has there not been cattle plague in Altona?—Yes, I think there was cattle plague in Altona in 1872; but when I spoke of Schleswig, I did so as being north of Holstein.

1329. The honourable Member for Manchester was questioning you as to the safety of the import of Schleswig-Holstein cattle, and you stated, in answer to him, that there had not been, during the present century, cattle plague in Schleswig-Holstein; I think that in 1872 there distinctly was cattle plague in that country at the port?—There might have been at Altona, but Tonning is at a considerable distance from there, and I was speaking with reference to Tonning.

1330. It would not be correct to represent the country as distinctly free from cattle plague under

Professor *Simonds.*

17 May 1877.

Chairman—continued.

under those circumstances?—No; we might represent Schleswig as being perfectly free from cattle plague, but not the port in Holstein.

1331. But you would not make any difference in your regulations between Schleswig and Holstein?—No, certainly not.

1332. Because they are both grazing countries dealing with the cattle of Denmark, for the purpose of fattening them for the English market?—Yes, that is so.

1333. Therefore it is only fair to say that there is the risk or that there has recently been the risk of cattle plague being introduced from Schleswig-Holstein through the port of Altona?—Yes.

Chairman—continued.

1334. Are you aware also that the port of Altona was subject to cattle plague on the present occasion?—I was not aware of that.

1335. That would modify your view, and make it, in your opinion, more necessary to restrict in some way the import of cattle from that country, would it not?—Yes, that has been the view acted upon with regard, to Schleswig-Holstein being until now they were scheduled countries.

1336. I only ask you that because the question of the honourable Member, and your answer, seemed to imply that Schleswig-Holstein might be treated as a free country like Denmark?—Just so.

Monday, 4th June 1877.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. John Holms.	Colonel Kingscote.
Mr. Anderson.	Mr. M'Lagan.
Mr. Assheton.	Sir Rainald Knightley.
Mr. Jacob Bright.	Mr. Pease.
Mr. Chamberlain.	Mr. Arthur Peel.
Mr. Chaplin.	Mr. Ritchie.
Mr. James Corry.	Sir Henry Selwin Ibbetson.
Mr. Elliot.	Mr. Torr.
Mr. E. Forster.	

SIR HENRY SELWIN IBBETSON, BART., IN THE CHAIR.

Professor CHARLES MÜLLER, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

1337. YOU are, I believe, Professor of Anatomy in the Berlin Veterinary College?—I am.

1338. And you are a member of the Veterinary Department of the Prussian Agricultural Ministry?—I am one of the six ordinary members of the Prussian Veterinary Department.

1339. As such have you been consulted as an expert in all cases relating to cattle plague since 1866?—I have.

1340. You are here, I believe, not at the desire of the German Government, but accidentally?—Accidentally. I am here in no official character, and I can only give evidence as a private individual; but, as a member of the Veterinary Department of Prussia, I know well all the regulations which were adopted on the last occasion against cattle plague, and also I know sufficiently the intentions of the Prussian Government.

1341. Can you describe to this Committee what the Veterinary Staff in Germany consist of?—There are in Prussia veterinary officers appointed by the Government, who have the quality of officials in every circle, and, perhaps, we have between 420 and 450 circles in the Prussian kingdom. Every circle has such a veterinary officer. In a few cases only, for two circles there is only one veterinary officer.

1342. As I understand you, these circles are districts of country entrusted to one of these veterinary inspectors?—That is so. There are exceptions, but very few exceptions, where two circles are entrusted to one veterinary officer. Those veterinary officers are paid by the Government, but they have only a small pay.

1343. I suppose that that represents a sort of retaining fee for their services?—Yes; only they must do their services gratis in the town or in the place where they are living. When they go out of that place only for a short distance, they get a fee, and they are well paid for all their services. In order to obtain persons who are more to be trusted and more to be relied upon, the Prussian kingdom pays a larger salary to those veterinary officers who have the circles on the eastern frontier from Memel, on the Baltic, to Upper Silesia.

Chairman—continued.

1344. There is then a difference between the veterinary inspectors in the interior of the country and those who are stationed in the circles that touch upon the frontier?—There is a difference, but there are common veterinary officers also in the border circles; they have only a greater salary than others. In the border districts, I believe, in the last two years, the Prussian Ministry has named officers, who are only for veterinary police, who have no practice, and who are forbidden to practice; they receive from the Government a salary high enough to enable them to live upon it without any practice; and those officers have only the duty of seeing that no cattle plague and other contagious diseases are introduced. Very often, by order of the Government, they made journeys in the kingdom of Poland to see how the cattle plague is spreading itself in Russian Poland. They are to say it in one phrase, not practically veterinaries; they are veterinaries with the quality of police officers.

1345. They are veterinary detectives, in fact?—Yes. The Polish information is not to be relied upon, and, therefore, the Prussian Government has named special veterinary officers to give all their attention to the cattle plague, and to the introduction of contagious diseases from Poland to Prussia.

1346. That is in consequence of that frontier being the most liable to the outbreak of cattle plague?—Yes; and also on the Austrian frontier it is the same, and I believe there are now six or seven such veterinary inspectors, who are only for the purpose of veterinary police.

1347. Has that system been long established, or is it a new introduction?—It is a new introduction since about 2½ years. We have higher veterinary officers in each Government, and in the highest instance there is the Veterinary Department in Berlin. We have three instances for veterinary questions, the veterinaries of the circle, the veterinaries of the Government, and the highest is the Veterinary Department in Berlin.

1348. They are all in communication with each other, but the staff on the frontier are working

Professor *Müller.*

4 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

ing as a police under the central Government?—Yes, under the Government of Prussia, not under the Government of the Empire; it is a Prussian institution.

1349. Will you describe to the Committee what are the regulations now in force on the Prussian frontier with reference to the prevention of the introduction of cattle plague?—As regards the regulations to prevent the introduction of cattle plague from Poland and from Austria into Prussia on the eastern frontier, I must make a difference between those measures which had been in force until the last outbreak of cattle plague, and those measures which have been adopted since, because we have learned new experiences by the last outbreak.

1350. Will you kindly state to the Committee what the regulations were before the cattle plague last broke out?—The measures which were in force before the last outbreak of cattle plague were, shortly, the following:—All importation of cattle from Russia has been prohibited since 1871, but in 1871 a mistake was made in that; the introduction by sea on the Baltic was not prohibited, and that was the cause that Russian cattle brought cattle plague through Germany to England in the year 1872. From 1871 to 1872 the introduction of Russian cattle was prohibited in Germany and in Prussia, and it is the same, because Prussia is the only country in Germany which has a frontier towards Poland. In 1872, cattle were brought by sea from Cronstadt to Lubeck on the Baltic, and they were brought from Lubeck to Hamburg on the railway, because by that way they avoided going through the Cattegat and around Tirtland, and these Russian cattle in 1872 brought the cattle plague to England, to Hull, as I believe. Therefore, in 1872, the importation of cattle was prohibited from Russia by sea, and since that time no cattle from Russia have gone to Germany and to Prussia by a lawful way.

1351. In fact, the cattle that produced the disease on this occasion must have been smuggled?—Yes, they must have been introduced into Prussia by an unlawful way. That is, as to the Russian frontier. On the Austrian frontier we have also the regulation since 1871, that no cattle are permitted to be introduced belonging to the grey steppe race. We call it the grey race because all the several races of the steppe cattle in Galicia, in Hungary, and in Russia, &c., are of a grey colour; it is a different nuance of grey.

1352. The grey oxen have been forbidden since the same date at which the frontier of Russia was closed?—Since 1872. I do not know whether the regulation is of the same date. I know only that it was forbidden a year before.

1353. Will you be able to put in a copy of the decree or law which prevented the introduction by sea of Russian cattle?—Yes. I have not it in London, but I will send it from Berlin.

1354. With regard to the Austrian frontier, were the cattle allowed to come in there with the exception of these grey oxen?—Yes, but under certain restrictions, some of which I have noted down here, and I can translate them. From Russia all importation of cattle is prohibited. From Austria is prohibited the introduction of all cattle belonging to the grey or to the steppe race. But now I must mix new measures and old measures. The Russian frontier runs from Memel

Chairman—continued.

on the Baltic to Cracow, as you can see on this map; and all along the Russian frontier no cattle can be introduced into Germany; all cattle are prohibited from Russia. From Cracow we have a long frontier line against Austria, in Silesia, in Saxony, and in Bavaria; and along all this frontier there is a regulation against the introduction of the grey oxen. This is not a Prussian regulation; this is a regulation of the empire; and it must be a regulation of the empire, because it is also in force on the Saxon and Bavarian frontiers, where the Prussian ministry have nothing to say. So on all this long line of frontier against Austria it is not permitted to introduce any cattle belonging to the grey or the steppe race, and it is only permitted to introduce cattle of other races under the following restrictions:—It must be proved by certificates of the Austrian authorities that those cattle have not been, within the last 30 days, in any place belonging to Galicia, to Bukowina, or to the lands of the Hungarian crown. The law is that cattle can only be introduced if they are brought from the other provinces of Austria on certificates that the cattle have been in the last 30 days in a place other than in all the districts that I have named. The second condition is that they must be brought with certificates from the Austrian authorities, that in the place where those cattle were fattened or fed there is no cattle plague within a circle of 135 kilometres.

1355. You mean that the Committee should understand that with regard to the introduction of these cattle across the frontier, they must be accompanied by a certificate showing that they have been for a given time within a particular area without disease?—Yes; and in particular provinces of Austria; and that the transport of such cattle goes through districts which are not infected. That is the second condition. The third condition is that the cattle must be examined on passing the frontier by a veterinary inspector of the Saxon, the Bavarian, or the Prussian Government.

1356. By one of the local inspectors?—Yes, by an inspector appointed by the authority. There are no differences between the introduction of cattle from Russia, and the conditions under which Austrian cattle can be introduced in the German Empire.

1357. Are those all the regulations that existed before the outbreak?—They were, and they are also in force in the present time.

1358. Would you now kindly tell the Committee what was done after the outbreak in consequence of it?—After the outbreak, our vigilance on the frontier line has been much strengthened; we have now a greater number of veterinary inspectors, and armed policemen, who have orders to keep watch that no cattle are imported in an unlawful manner across the frontier, and also all the customs officers on the frontier have orders to keep their eye open upon the movement of cattle. We have now on the whole frontier, from Memel to Cracow, and also on the Austrian frontier, what we call in German "Cattlecataster." There is in every village a list of cattle taken, and the proprietor of the cattle must give notice of any change in his cattle; if he is selling the cattle, or if he is buying the cattle, or if the cattle are dying, or if they are slaughtered, he must give notice of it, and the list is rectified by these notices.

1359. You

Chairman—continued.

1359. You have really a census of the cattle all over the districts?—Yes, that is the word for it. All changes in the position of the cattle must be announced to the authority, and there are some officers who are not paid, who hold an honorary post, and whom we term revisers, who have to control all these lists, and by these lists we can now find out if any cattle have got unlawfully into the possession of the proprietors.

1360. Does that census of cattle apply to the whole country, or simply to a border ground?—Only to the border. During the outbreak of the cattle plague it was an institution in all the country, but now that the cattle plague has been stamped out in Prussia, it is only an institution in force on the border.

1361. Is it proposed for the future to maintain a zone round the frontier in which a census of the cattle is to be continued?—As far as I am informed, this institution will be retained as long as there is a peril from Poland; and this period will last for a long time, because the Russian army is now on the march, and it is always experienced that when the Russian army is marching cattle plague is following the army. Then we have also a new measure prohibiting the import of all cattle and of all sheep in a particular district of Silesia. In the government of Oppeln (which you call in English Upper Silesia), no cattle and no sheep and no goats can be brought across the frontier. In Silesia there are three governments: Breslau, Liegnitz, and Oppeln; Oppeln is the most perilous part of Silesia, because on the one side it has Poland, and on the other side Austria. The province of Posen divides Lower Silesia from Poland. It is necessary to prohibit the introduction of all cattle from Austria into Upper Silesia because there is a great number of railways, and we fear that Russian cattle will come by railway through Austria to Silesia.

1362. Do you allow cattle to be trucked on the frontier and taken through your country?—No, that has been stopped.

1363. Is that one of the new regulations?—It has been stopped from Poland since 1871, and from Austria it was only allowed under the restrictions which I have named; and now, in the government of Oppeln, in Upper Silesia, no cattle can be introduced.

1364. That is to say, they must be driven a certain distance before they can be put upon the railroad for transit?—That is another measure, and I have here the Order. We call it a Circular Order from the Minister of Commerce and the Minister of Agricultural Affairs, and this I can hand in. It is an Order from the Prussian Government to prevent the introduction of smuggled cattle; that in a certain district, called a zone, no cattle shall be loaded in railway carriages. (*The Witness described the zone to the Committee upon a map.*)

1365. That zone, as I understand you, represents the line which separates the country where cattle can be placed upon the railroads from the frontier over which they cross?—Yes; I have marked with pins the line of the stations nearest to the frontier where it is allowed to load cattle in railway trucks, under certain restrictions which I will state. In the district bordered on one side by the frontier line, and on the other side by the line of pins which I have stuck in the map, no cattle can, under any conditions, be loaded on railways. The first stations where cattle can be loaded at are those stations which I have marked with the pins, and here, also, it is only allowed to load cattle in railway trucks by special permission given by the administrative head of the circle; the Landrath (so this head of administration is called) has instructions to give those permissions only to great landowners, or to persons in his own circle whom he knows personally, and to persons whom he is convinced can be trusted.

1366. That is an additional safeguard beyond the fact that you have to drive the cattle under the eye of your inspectors for a certain distance before they can be put upon the railway?—Yes, but this measure which I have sought to explain gives us the hope to stamp out smuggling; our difficulty lies in the smuggling of cattle. The great attraction to smuggling is the winning of money, and the greater is the difference between the price of cattle in Poland and in Prussia the greater will be the attraction to the smuggling of cattle. The more the regulations tend to lessen the winnings of smugglers, the more easily smuggling will be kept down. Now, if we force a smuggler to transport the smuggled cattle, say 25 or 30 English miles, then they will lose so much that smuggling will not pay, and by driving these cattle through the border districts, there will often be an opportunity to detect the smugglers, and we believe that by these measures we shall, in process of time, keep down smuggling.

1367. What do you do with that particular zone district with regard to the cattle that are within the district itself?—They must also be transported to the first station where the loading of cattle is permitted under the restrictions I mentioned above.

1368. Is a permit required with them also before they are allowed to go on the railway?—Yes, they must have a permission from the administrative head of the circle; but from that line to the interior there are no restrictions on the loading of cattle in railway trucks. It is only in these border stations where a special permission is required; at all the other stations inland from this line the loading is free. I must now draw the attention of the Committee to another measure which will take place, and which, I believe, will give the best protection both to our own land and also to foreign countries. We cannot deny that we have not given our attention enough to the cattle markets in the great towns, and with our numerous railways very often cattle plague spreads itself from these markets with great quickness in the land; therefore it is now ordered that when the first case of cattle plague is found out in the border district, say in a village in Upper Silesia, the same day all cattle markets will be closed for export; that is to say, on the same day when it is announced in Berlin that cattle plague is in the border district, on that same day any cattle will be prohibited from going from the cattle market in Breslau, from the cattle market in Berlin, from the cattle market in Hamburg, and from the cattle market in Dresden.

1369. You propose, in fact, to close all markets on the announcement being made to the central authority that there has been a case of cattle plague detected?—Yes, on the same day; but only the markets for slaughtering purposes. I

Professor *Müller.*

4 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

am sure if this measure is taken, it is quite impossible that cattle plague can go through the land as it did in the last outbreak.

1370. Would you place any restrictions upon cattle going through the country for store purposes?—No; we put no restrictions upon the markets in the little towns where only store cattle are bought and sold. Only in the vicinity of the infected village, in a circle bounded by a periphery of 20 English miles, no cattle-fair, or market can be held.

1371. I believe your last outbreak arose from what you have described as smuggled cattle?—From smuggled cattle.

1372. That was across the Polish frontier, was it not?—On the Polish frontier, in Upper Silesia, in a great mining town called Beuthen.

1373. And it was not discovered for some little time?—It was not discovered for some little time; it was between, I believe, four and five days.

1374. Those cattle which were smuggled across had been moved to several of your towns before it was discovered, had they not?—They had been moved to Breslau.

1375. All that had taken place before the central authority had become aware of it?—Before the authority had detected the outbreak of cattle plague; and between the day of the smuggling and the day when the cattle plague was detected in Upper Silesia, the infected cattle had gone to Breslau market, and had spread it from the Breslau market to Berlin.

1376. And then the cattle had gone from there to Hamburg and to Berlin, and that was the origin of the outbreak in this country?—Yes.

1377. But all this time the central authority were unaware of the outbreak?—They knew of the outbreak in Silesia, but they did not know that infected cattle had been going from Silesia over the country. It was not the smuggled cattle that had gone directly to Berlin, but it was cattle that had been in contact with the diseased smuggled cattle.

1378. How is cattle plague dealt with in Germany by the central authority?—The law to stamp out cattle plague is a law of the Empire. It is under the regulations of the German Empire, and not under the regulations of single States.

1379. On whom does the cost of carrying out the regulations fall?—It is all paid out of the Treasury of the Empire.

1380. What is your mode of dealing with cattle plague, on an outbreak being discovered?—If an outbreak is discovered, all cattle that are diseased, and all cattle that have been in contact with diseased cattle, are killed by order of the authority, and the owner is paid compensation to the full value of the cattle.

1381. Of all that are diseased?—Yes; the common value per head; that is to say, the value that it will have under any circumstances. It may be, for example, that a bull may have a great breeding value, but the breeding value we do not pay for.

1382. It is the direct market value for food?—It is the direct market value for food; and for a milking cow also, the value which a milking cow will have in the market is paid.

1383. Do I correctly understand you to say that in this compensation they do not take into consideration the fact of an animal being of a particular class or breed?—We do not pay for that. We call that breeding value, and we pay only the common value.

Chairman—continued.

1384. You pay a uniform value according to the market prices of the animal?—Yes, what it will fetch in the market.

1385. Apart from its particular value?—Apart from its particular value for breeding. The Treasury of the Empire also pays for all costs for disinfection, and for the burying of the animals.

1386. Have you any particular regulations with regard to burying the diseased animals when slaughtered?—They are buried so that they are covered two metres with earth. Healthy cattle may be consumed occasionally as human food, but that is only allowed, it is not ordered; it is under the responsibility of the officers. In great towns and in slaughtering houses under the surveillance of the police, healthy cattle, which have only been killed because they were in contact with diseased animals, may be used for public consumption.

1387. When an inspector certifies that they may be so killed, cattle which have been in contact with diseased animals, may be used for human consumption?—Yes, but only in great towns and in slaughtering houses under the superintendence of the police.

1388. In great towns do they bury the diseased animals on the spot?—Yes, on the spot.

1389. The cost, as I understand you, in all cases falling upon the Imperial Government?—Upon the Imperial Government.

1390. Is the compensation the same for the cattle which are slaughtered for having been in contact with the diseased animals, as it is for the diseased animals themselves?—It is quite the same; and the cattle that have died from the disease are also paid for with the full value.

1391. All are paid for at their full value?—At their full value.

1392. Besides the veterinary inspectors on your frontier, where cattle plague exists, you draw a cordon of soldiers around the frontier, do you not?—Yes, when cattle plague has broken out in the border districts of Poland or Austria.

1393. And they are assisted also by your customs officers, are they not?—By the Custom House officers in ordinary times; but if cattle plague in Poland and in Austria is nearing the Prussian frontier, there is a military cordon put upon the frontier; and if cattle plague breaks out in a village, it is the rule to put a cordon of soldiers around the village, another around the infected premises; but the village or the premises may also be guarded by civil guards, like the gardes champêtres, by the peasants themselves, and in this case, if the peasantry do supply guards to close the village and the premises, then the community must pay for the guards.

1394. Then there is a charge that does fall upon the locality?—Yes; and also the little houses for disinfection must be paid for by the local authority.

1395. But the actual cost of the disinfectants and the actual cost of the slaughter, is paid from the Imperial Treasury?—Yes, in the same manner also, the expenses for the military cordon.

1396. I suppose, in your opinion, there is great difficulty, is there not, in discovering the first cases of this disease in your markets?—There is the greatest difficulty, in the first place, to discover it in the markets for slaughtering purposes.

1397. It

Chairman—continued.

1397. It is easier to detect it in the living animal than it is in the dead carcase, is it not?—My opinion is that it is more easily detected in living animals than by a post-mortem examination.

1398. You agree, then, with Professor Brown in his opinion that the post-mortem examination does not always indicate the disease?—The post-mortem examination gives us only a greater security if we have seen before the same cattle in a living state. If I can see the symptoms in the living cattle, and then make a post-mortem examination, it will be a greater security to give a right diagnosis.

1399. But your best proof, then, is really in seeing the spread of the disease?—Yes; we must take it altogether, and I will never throw a stone at a veterinary inspector who does not judge rightly on the first case. It is very difficult to judge rightly on the first case, and especially in the slaughtering markets, because in the slaughtering markets a great number of oxen will be killed in the same day, or on the next day after their arrival, and they may be in the first stage of the disease, showing no very marked symptoms, and they are able to infect other cattle.

1400. All this makes it very difficult to draw up regulations that will give you security on your frontier?—The greatest security for our frontier will be the district on the border where no smuggled cattle can be loaded in railway trucks, and the strict supervision of the cattle in our border districts. The best means to prevent the propagation of the cattle plague out of Germany will be that all exportation markets will be closed on the first day when the first case of cattle plague has been found in the border districts. That, I believe, will be the greatest security.

1401. Are you at all contemplating dealing with the cattle on your frontier as the British Government have dealt with cattle at Deptford, by setting up a slaughtering market there?—If I understand you rightly, you ask if we have not the intention of making a regulation on our frontier similar to your regulations at Deptford. We have such a plan, because, as I have told you before, Upper Silesia is a great mining district, producing no food, but only consuming; the whole district is like a great town. In all the districts of Upper Silesia, and on the right side of the River Oder, the people live as it were in a great town; there is no sufficient agricultural production at all; and therefore it will perhaps be necessary in future for the purpose of feeding this population, to get some meat from Poland and Russia. Therefore it is the intention to build great slaughtering houses on the frontier, and there to allow the slaughtering of Austrian cattle under veterinary inspection, so that this meat may be eaten by the people in the mining district; but we believe that it will be a very long time before all these intentions are put in force.

1402. This is only an intention?—It is only an intention.

1403. With regard to this last outbreak at Hamburg, at present, I believe, that there is some sort of international understanding between the Governments about telegraphing outbreaks mutually to each other, and this outbreak in Hamburg was not detected until the 13th, was it?—In the evening of the 13th of January.

Chairman—continued.

1404. No telegram arrived in England until after the animals arrived; was there any mistake with regard to that telegram?—There was a mistake, and it was also a misfortune, if one may so term it. The veterinary inspector in Altona saw the first cases of cattle plague in the evening of the 13th, and he did not give positive judgment about the case, but only said, "I suspect that it may be cattle plague." On the Saturday evening this opinion of the veterinary surgeon was telegraphed to the Government in Schleswig, and on the Sunday morning, which was the 14th of January, the cattle plague was discovered in Altona, and then the police inspector in Altona telegraphed to the Government on the morning of Sunday.

1405. So that, in consequence of its being Sunday, there was a delay?—There was a delay in consequence of its being Sunday, and the telegram was sent from Schleswig to Deptford on Monday morning.

1406. That is a condition of things which makes it very unsafe to export cattle?—Yes; it is also felt that it was a mistake, and, therefore, I know for a certainty that it is the intention of the Prussian Minister that in future all outbreaks of cattle plague will be telegraphed from the spot here to the Privy Council, or to any English office you may name, and not by the Central Government, but by every local authority. Every local authority is in future to telegraph each outbreak of cattle plague directly to the Privy Council, or to such office as you may name.

1407. Is that an order which has been already issued?—It is already given, or will be given in the next time.

1408. Have you a copy of that order here?—I have not, because I have not come here with the intention of giving evidence; but I will procure it, and put it in the hands of the Committee.

1409. By that means, in future, we may hope to get an earlier instruction of any outbreak in your country?—I am sure you will have it on the day of the first outbreak.

1410. Can you give the expenses of the last outbreak of cattle plague, separating them into the expenses for compensation and the expenses for disinfection?—As those expenses are not yet accounted for, I can give only an estimate of them. I have here a paper which I have sent to the Privy Council, containing our losses by cattle plague, and from it I can give you the number of head of cattle. There were 1,260 head of cattle killed, 321 sheep, and 9 goats.

1411. Was that during the three months in which the cattle plague continued in Germany; January, February, and March?—Yes, it is the whole loss that we have had in the recent outbreak. We had an outbreak of cattle plague in 47 places in 180 premises, and there died, or were killed by order of the authority, 1,260 head of cattle, 321 sheep, and nine goats. There were killed and left for human consumption 69 head of cattle and 16 sheep.

1412. Those were allowed to be sold for food?—Those were allowed to be sold for food. That was in Hamburg and in a place of Saxony (Chernnitz).

1413. And the others were killed and buried?—The others were killed and buried. You may say that now the value of a head of cattle will be, on the average, 300 marks; and you must remember that under the new German currency

Professor *Müller.*

4 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

a mark is exactly equivalent to the English shilling.

1414. That is about 15 *l.* a head, then?—Yes, on the average; and we may reckon that the expenses for disinfection will be the same as for the cattle that were killed.

1415. You mean that there will be an amount of 15 *l.* a head for disinfection?—The expenses generally. I take an average 15 *l.* per head of cattle, and if I multiply that by 1,260, that will be the sum paid for all the other expenses including disinfection.

1416. So that if 15 *l.* is the average, double that amount per head is what the average cost of the outbreak to the Government was?—Yes.

1417. In that cost, is the destruction of buildings included?—All costs, and also the cost for burying.

1418. In that outbreak you had a very large number of premises which had to be paid for, had you not?—A very large number. The greatest number of premises destroyed was in Altona, because the peril was the greatest there. The premises in Altona were not premises for store cattle, but were premises for the cattle trade, and it was very perilous to have infective matter in such premises.

1419. In your experience, have you found that sheep convey cattle plague?—I have seen it once. In the war against France, in 1870 and 1871, we had cattle plague in Western Germany and also in France; France suffered much from cattle plague during the war, and I have seen cattle plague in sheep in Alsace and Lorraine in France; but it is comparatively seldom that the sheep suffer from cattle plague, although they may of course suffer from cattle plague as every ruminant may. In 1865, when cattle plague was so much spread in England, very costly and expensive gazelles and other animals of the ruminant tribe in the Jardin d'Acclimatization in Paris also caught cattle plague and died.

1420. Therefore, in your opinion, though sheep may carry the disease, they do not often spread it?—They may carry the disease and they may spread it, but it is very seldom that that happens.

1421. Looking at all these precautions that you propose to take, have you considered the question of the continued export of live animals to this country from Germany?—I believe that it can be continued without great peril, for you see we are learning by every outbreak, and all the mistakes that have been made will be avoided, I believe, in future. The greatest mistakes that were made in this last outbreak of cattle plague were, in the first case, that the German authorities telegraphed a little too late, and that the examination of the cattle that were brought over by the "Castor" was perhaps made a little too superficially. Therefore the two veterinary inspectors have been put under trial, and the Prussian inspector has been punished, and has lost his situation.

1422. The man who inspected the cattle before they were placed on board the "Castor"?—Yes; and the Hamburg veterinary inspector, so far as I am informed, is not yet punished, the trial being till now not finished; but in Prussia the inspector is already removed from his place; and in future the examinations in Altona will be put under veterinary inspectors who can be relied upon.

Chairman—continued.

1423. I understand you to say that, in your opinion, the importation under these new regulations might safely be continued for slaughtering purposes?—For slaughtering purposes.

1424. The animals being sent to Deptford?—To be sent to Deptford; and I believe also, with the same exception in favour of Schleswig-Holstein; for in Schleswig-Holstein there are many circumstances which give the greatest security against any cattle disease.

1425. You mean that Schleswig-Holstein, from its being a grazing country, protects itself very much against cattle plague?—It completely protects itself, because all the circumstances are such that Schleswig-Holstein has ever been free from cattle plague.

1426. Leaving cattle plague, would you tell the Committee what regulations there are in your country with regard to pleuro-pneumonia?—In Prussia, pleuro pneumonia is dealt with in a similar manner to cattle plague. There are many places in Prussia where you have pleuro-pneumonia every year, and then again you have provinces where pleuro-pneumonia is very seldom to be found. I have before me the Report from the Veterinary Department as to the spreading of contagious diseases among animals, and in the last quarter of last year there was no pleuro-pneumonia in Berlin, in East Prussia, in two governments of Pomerania, in Schleswig-Holstein, and in a great part of Hanover; but we have also a province where we have great losses by pleuro-pneumonia, and that is in the vicinity of Magdeburg.

1427. Do you treat pleuro-pneumonia in the same way as you do cattle plague, that is to say, slaughtering animals?—Slaughtering the animals, but only the diseased animals.

1428. What regulations have you with regard to those animals that are in contact with the disease?—They are put under a sequestration; they are shut in the stables.

1429. For how long?—Till three months after the last case of the disease.

1430. They are kept in quarantine for two months before they are allowed to move about? They are kept in the stables; they are not allowed to go free in the fields.

1431. And you think that is a sufficient protection against their carrying the infection?—I believe so; three months is the minimum time.

1432. In your opinion, as belonging to the Veterinary Department, does that give security as against the spreading of the disease by those animals?—I believe so, because all that are diseased are killed on the spot, and because in the next six months after, cattle from the infected premises can be sold only for slaughter.

1433. Is the compensation with regard to pleuro-pneumonia in your country dealt with in the same way as with regard to cattle plague?—No, it is quite another matter.

1434. What amount do you pay in the case of killed animals?—In the province of Saxony we are paying the half, and in all the other provinces we are paying four-fifths of the value.

1435. How is that raised; is it raised on the locality by a rate?—By a certain rate. We have provincial parliaments, *Etats de province*, or *Etats généraux*, quite the same as in the French departments, and they are raising a tax of, say, a penny, or a halfpenny for every head of cattle.

1436. Can

Chairman—continued.

1436. Can you give the Committee the reason that has caused the distinction as between cattle plague and pleuro-pneumonia, that in the one case you make it a charge upon the imperial funds, and in the other case you make it a charge upon the local funds by a rate?—Because the veterinary law against pleuro-pneumonia and other contagious diseases is not a law of the empire, but is a law of Prussia.

1437. Then it is a law that you do not apply to the whole empire?—It is a law of the kingdom of Prussia only, and not a law of the empire.

1438. I suppose you enforce by penalties the carrying out of this law?—Yes, there are penalties if the tax is not paid. It is a rate paid upon every head of cattle. There is a fund collected, and from this fund is paid the compensation for cattle killed to stamp out pleuro-pneumonia.

1439. Do I correctly understand you to say that what you describe as the regulations with regard to pleuro-pneumonia are the regulations of Prussia alone, or do they apply to the whole of the empire?—To Prussia alone.

1440. Are you aware what the regulations are as to pleuro-pneumonia in the other parts of the German Empire?—I am not much informed about it.

1441. Have you tried inoculation with regard to pleuro-pneumonia?—We have tried it, and it is also much in force in Saxony. In the district of Magdeburg there are a great number of sugar fabrics for manufacturing sugar from beetroot; and all those great manufactories have a great number of oxen; they change their oxen every year once or twice, and therefore they have always pleuro-pneumonia, and they are inoculating it. But in all the other provinces they are not fond of inoculation; it is not the custom to inoculate much.

1442. Do you yourself believe in inoculation as a prevention of pleuro-pneumonia?—I am against inoculation, but there are many men of high position in the profession who are great friends of inoculation. It is a party question.

1443. As I understand from your evidence, at least as far as Prussia is concerned, there is a very large amount of pleuro-pneumonia, and no means of absolutely stamping it out have been adopted?—We are now hoping to stamp it out, because we are killing every diseased animal, and because we have shut our frontier against the import from the Netherlands.

1444. And you believe that by closing your frontier against import and by slaughtering the diseased animals, you will be able to stamp out the disease?—Yes, because we constantly have had pleuro-pneumonia again from the Netherlands. We have store cattle and milking cows from the Netherlands, and the Netherlands are the hotbed of pleuro-pneumonia.

1445. With regard to foot and mouth disease, does that prevail to any great extent in Germany?—Yes; but there are no very stringent regulations to stamp out foot and mouth disease, for we are of opinion that the means of stamping out would be worse than the disease itself.

1446. You mean to say that you believe that to stamp out foot and mouth disease the restrictions would be so severe that they would not be tolerated?—They could not be tolerated. We receive foot and mouth disease time after time from Russia and from Poland by pigs. There is a great trade in pigs from Poland to Prussia, and by that means foot and mouth disease is introduced again.

1447. And you believe that it would be impossible to do away with foot and mouth disease by any regulations that the people would put up with?—If we succeeded in stamping it out we should have it again the next year by the pig trade from Poland.

1448. I suppose that you would admit that the foot and mouth disease is very infectious?—It is very infectious. I am of opinion that the contagious virus is more to be feared in foot and mouth disease than in cattle plague; it is more contagious than cattle plague.

1449. Yet notwithstanding that, you do not believe that you could attempt to stamp it out in the country?—No, I do not believe that we could do it.

1450. On the ground that the measures that would be required to stamp it out would be found to be so restrictive that they would not be tolerated?—No, they would not be tolerated, because I believe that the measure would entail a greater loss than the disease itself. With regard to foot and mouth disease, the last time it broke out, in the year 1876, we had it only, in round numbers, in 300 premises, and the loss in Prussia during the time from October to the end of the year was seven head of cattle.

1451. Does glanders prevail in Germany?—We had many glandered horses in Germany after the war. The army horses introduced the glanders from France.

1452. Do you slaughter in the case of glanders?—The animals are killed by order of the authority, and they are paid for, the compensation being half the value.

1453. Does that compensation fall, as in the case of cattle plague, upon the Imperial Treasury?—No; as in the case of pleuro-pneumonia, it falls upon the local authority by a tax, which is levied upon every horse-owner. Each horse pays a penny a year or a halfpenny a year, and by those pence a fund is raised out of which the compensation is paid.

1454. Is there any other point that you would like to put in in evidence?—I would only hand in a Table showing how much glanders has been lessened in horses by the measures which we have adopted. I would beg permission to say a few words about the evidence of Professor Brown. There are some points which I have noted down from the proof sheets which Professor Brown was kind enough to give me. Concerning Question 13, I would only say that the cattle plague was introduced into England in 1872, not by German cattle, but by Russian cattle. In answer to Question 94, Professor Brown says that the introduction of dead meat has been prohibited in England because you feared that, after the outbreak in Germany, they would kill the diseased or suspected cattle, and bring infected meat here. That is not to be feared, because nobody would kill cattle and bring meat of the killed cattle to England and lose money by it, when he can get from the Imperial Treasury the whole value of the animals.

1455. What you mean is that our protection in that case is that your Government pays the full value?—The full value. What Professor Brown suggests is never to be feared. I cannot accept the statement of Professor Brown in this matter.

Professor *Müller.*

4 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

1456. In your opinion, in consequence of the fact that it would be a loss to the exporter, the infected meat would not come in?—No; it is against the interest of the owners to do as Professor Brown suggested. Then I would draw your attention to the answer to Question 276. That is a mistake. The five sheep in Emden were not killed because they had cattle plague; they were killed because they had been in contact with infected cattle.

1457. Those 100 sheep mentioned there were only a flock of sheep that happened to be in contact with the diseased animals?—There was during the last outbreak only one case, and also a doubtful case, in Emden. In the beginning of March a sheep had been killed because the veterinary officer was of opinion that it might have cattle plague; but those five sheep of which Professor Brown spoke had been killed only because they had been in contact with infected cattle. Then, in the answer to Question 286, the remarks about clergymen are an error. It is never the case in Germany that a peasant goes to a clergyman to ask him to act as a veterinary surgeon in a village. Then I must make a remark also about Question 640. The smuggler in Upper Silesia was not shot, but he is in prison and under trial.

1458 Was no one shot upon that occasion?—Yes; I believe three or four were shot by the soldiers.

1459. But not the particular criminal?—No; he is in prison and under trial.

1460. He is in prison at this moment, is he not?—At this moment. I do not know if the judgment is already out, but I know he is under trial, and he will have two or three years' imprisonment.

1461. With regard to the men who were shot, which is, perhaps, a worse case, why were they shot?—Because they were breaking through the cordon; they were shot because they did not obey. The sentry has orders to let no man pass, and that if he challenges a man three times and he does not stand, he is to shoot at him.

1462. Did those people refuse to answer the challenge of the sentry?—Yes.

1463. Were they deaf?—In one unfortunate case, near Breslan, it was a deaf boy.

1464. Are there any special restrictions as between Germany proper and that part of Germany known as Schleswig-Holstein?—No; that is against our laws; we cannot have restrictions and guarantees in our own country.

1465. In fact our protection in the case of Schleswig-Holstein cattle is identical and the same with the protection which we get in the case of German cattle?—It is, your protection lying only in the circumstances that Schleswig-Holstein introduces no cattle or very few cattle from Germany.

Mr. *W. E. Forster.*

1466. This last outbreak of cattle plague was the worst that you have had for some time, was it not?—Yes; since 1870 and 1871, during the war.

1467. Will you state how many outbreaks you have had during the last six years?—We had the great outbreak during the war in 1870 and 1871; that was the greatest outbreak that we have had in this century; after that we had only few outbreaks, some of them where the diagnosis was very dubious in the vicinity of our frontier.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

1468. In what year was that?—In 1872 we had the case in Hamburg; in 1874 we had cases only in Beuthen, in Upper Silesia; and in 1875 we had a case in East Prussia, as to which I have grave doubts whether it was cattle plague; and also in Saxony, as to which I am convinced that it was not cattle plague.

1469. We got cattle plague by the "Castor's" cargo; from what part of Germany do you think the cattle came which gave the infection in Hamburg?—I know this matter very well, because I have been commissary of the Empire in the last outbreak in Hamburg and Breslau, &c. The cattle on board the "Castor" were from three stables in Altona, and all the cattle that were infected and were diseased in Altona, were out of the same herd that also were in the "Castor." They were cattle from Silesia.

1470. How long had the cattle plague been discovered to exist on German territory before that cargo was shipped from Hamburg?—The first case of cattle plague in Germany was detected in Upper Silesia, on the 5th of January.

1471. You will observe that this case tends to show that we are in danger of cattle plague almost as soon as it breaks out in your country?—Yes, I cannot deny it.

1472. I suppose that it is rather the interest of the owners of cattle which are supposed to be at all infected, to send them as quickly as possible to a large market like Hamburg?—It is the interest of the cattle traders, not of the cattle owners; I mean of the farmers.

1473. Do you remember the outbreak of cattle plague in 1872?—I do.

1474. At that time we discovered the cattle plague in a given cargo before you were aware of its existence in Hamburg?—That is the case.

1475. How do you account for that?—I must tell you it as I remember it. The cattle were brought from Cronstadt to Lubeck, and from there to Hamburg; and on the pasture, near Hamburg, the cattle were taken and put together with Hamburg cattle, and were then brought in a ship to England. There was no case of disease in the pastures, but during the transport to the ship the disease was propagated; it was only after ten days that we had the first case on the Hamburg pasture. That was the second propagation of the disease in Germany, and you saw the first propagation on the ship.

1476. Then the fact was that, in 1872, we had the disease before you had it in Hamburg?—Yes; because you had the first propagation, and we had the second propagation.

1477. With regard to the prohibition of import into Germany from Russia, was it not the case that for some time after that law was passed it was still possible to put cattle on to a railway, and to take them through Germany to be exported here?—No transit is ever dealt with as import.

1478. Was it not so for a time?—It might be so before 1871, but never since.

1479. Where do you think cattle plague is at present?—In Poland, I believe; and I have seen in English newspapers a telegram that it has spread in Poland now more than it did the last time.

1480. You

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

1480. You mean Russian Poland?—Russian Poland.

1481. It is in Galicia?—According to the Austrian news it is not, but I believe it is.

1482. Do you think it is in Roumania?—I have no information as to that; but I am certain it is, because it follows the Russian army.

1483. Is it in Transylvania and Bulrowina?—That is the land of the Hungarian Crown, and all the lands of the Hungarian Crown are, according to the reports, free from cattle plague; but in reality, I believe, they are not.

1484. That being the case, and there being this great danger of cattle plague in the Hungarian territories, why do your Government, with their great anxiety to keep safe, make a distinction between the grey breed and the other Austrian or Hungarian cattle?—Because on the lands of the Hungarian Crown only cattle of the grey colour is bred; they have only those grey cattle in Hungary.

1485. Then, in fact, your prohibition of the grey cattle prohibits, generally speaking, the Hungarian cattle:—Yes, and the Galician cattle and cattle of Bukowina.

1486. Have you any large distilleries in Silesia?—Not many in Upper Silesia.

1487. Have you large distilleries like the Moravian distilleries?—We have not, but we have great sugar fabrics.

1488. What happened in Moravia where there is a large trade in cattle which are brought from the East and fed up in the distilleries, does not apply to your country?—No, the cattle which are fattened in the Moravian distilleries being chiefly of the grey race, go chiefly to the Vienna market.

1489. What districts in Germany are those which export most to England?—Schleswig-Holstein, Oldenburg, and the vicinity of Madgeburg in Saxony.

1490. Do many cattle come from Pomerania?—No, not many. The cattle in Pomerania are a small breed, and they go to the Berlin market.

1491. I suppose the Berlin market has got to be a very much larger market than it was?—It is not only a market for Berlin itself, but it is also a great export market for the great manufacturing towns in the Rhenish provinces, which receive many head of cattle from the Berlin markets.

1492. Returning to your regulations in regard to cattle plague, do you order the slaughter of any animals except those that either have the disease or have been in contact with those that have the disease?—We order the slaughter of all diseased cattle, and of all those cattle that have been in contact with them; but we go sometimes further. If th ecattle plague is on several premises in the same village, we have the power to order also the slaughter of cattle in premises that are not infested. I say, "Here is a great peril; I will not let the disease go further;" and, as Commissioner of the Empire, I have the power to say, "Here are infected premises, and here are four premises around them with healthy cattle; and now to save the village I can order that all the cattle around an infected place may be killed."

1493. Will you be kind enough to look at a suggestion, which was made by the Committee of the House of Commons in 1873, which seem to me to be similar to that which you carry out, and tell me whether I am correct in that?—That is what I would say.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

Professor *Müller*.

4 June 1877.

1494. You find that it is necessary, in order to stamp out the disease, that you should have the power of ordering the slaughter of cattle in a limited area around the animals that are actually infected or are in contact with those which are infected?—I believe it is necessary, and I must here draw your attention to our first experience. I say that although the stamping out of cattle plague, and of every other contagious animal disease, seems to be in the first instance exceedingly expensive, it is the cheapest in the long run.

1495. Then I suppose you have no hope of curing the disease of cattle plague; you think that no measure answers excepting stamping out?—No; and in Germany every experiment in giving physic or in treating the malady is prohibited under a heavy penalty.

1496. I imagine, from what you have stated, that the loss and the alarm of this last outbreak have made your Government more determined than ever to guard against the disease for the future?—Yes, and to take the most energetic means for dealing with it. It is my private opinion that we shall have cattle plague accidentally in one or other border village, and that is of no great question; but our greatest care now is not to let it go beyond the border, and therefore we must take the most stringent means to protect our own country. We have gained experience in the last outbreak that cattle plague goes from the border districts to the great cattle markets, and that the great cattle markets are the most perilous in spreading the disease. Therefore I see that the greatest protection now is in this regulation, that all cattle markets must be closed on the same day when the first case is found out in a border village. Let me exemplify that; in the last outbreak, if we had closed the cattle market in Breslau, the cattle market in Berlin, the cattle market in Dresden, and the cattle market in Hamburg, on the 5th of January 1872, when the first case of cattle plague was found out in a Silesian village, I do not believe that the cattle plague could have gone to England.

1497. With regard to the closing of markets, what was done when you closed the market at Berlin, for instance?—We let all cattle come to the market, but we do not allow any cattle to go living from the market.

1498. So that you do not prevent the slaughter for the food of Berlin?—We let them come in, but we do not allow any cattle to go out alive from the market.

1499. With regard to pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease, if you will take Professor Brown's Report in your hands, you will observe that at page 51, he says that "Only one outbreak of pleuro-pneumonia was reported from Germany during the past year, which occurred in the month of February in the province of Pomerania. Since then, however, the disease was detected in German cattle by the inspectors at the ports in this country, in the months of April, June, and August." By that paragraph, it would appear that the reports to us did not at all correspond with the extent of the disease?—Certainly not.

1500. Could you explain why that is the case?—I do not believe that there is any international

Professor *Müller*.

4 June 1877.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued

arrangement to report about pleuro-pneumonia. I do not know who it was that reported that it was in Pomerania; but perhaps the consul.

1501. The fact is, that you have had pleuro-pneumonia in a good many places in Germany?—In very many places, but I believe not in so many as you have it England.

1502. And the same remark would apply to foot-and-mouth disease?—The same remark applies to foot-and-mouth disease.

1503. You are not surprised at our regulation for ordering the slaughter of German animals at Deptford?—No, I believe that it is necessary, under the present circumstances, to slaughter German cattle at Deptford, only without Schleswig; for Schleswig there may be an exception.

1504. With regard to Schleswig, it is impossible for you to have a law separating Schleswig from the rest of Germany, is it not?—That is not possible, as in England it would not be possible to have a law for a single province.

1505. Have you read the regulations which we put in force to give us some security with regard to Schleswig?—Yes.

1506. Is it your impression that they are really sufficient to guard us?—Completely so, because you are importing through Schleswig-Holstein only Danish cattle, and cattle bred in Schleswig; the greatest part of the cattle imported by way of Schleswig-Holstein is Danish cattle.

1507. But against that we have the fact that we had cattle plague in 1872 and in 1877 at Hamburg, and in fact it has spread into the border of the Schleswig-Holstein district?—Into the Holstein district, but not into the Schleswig district. It was in villages which may be called suburbs of Hamburg, if you except Ellerbeck, which is seven or eight English miles from Hamburg. All the others are in the immediate vicinity of Hamburg and Altona. There was a cow that was sold from Hamburg to a peasant in Ellerbeck, and in Ellerbeck there was only one premise infected.

1508. I suppose the cattle trade being the most important trade to Schleswig-Holstein they are excessively strict in drawing a cordon?—They are strictest in Germany.

1509. In 1871 you stopped the import from Russia into Germany, did you not?—Yes, but not by sea.

1510. When did you stop the sea import?—After the misfortune in Hamburg.

Mr. *Assheton*.

1511. I understood you to tell us that the compensation for animals killed for cattle plague was paid out of Imperial sources?—Yes, from the Imperial Treasury.

1512. And that the compensation paid for cattle killed for pleuro-pneumonia was paid out of local rates?—Yes, if you translate it in such a manner. We call it provincial funds. A province with us is a greater territory than your local provinces. We have only ten provinces in Prussia.

1513. I am aware of that, but why is the compensation for pleuro-pneumonia less than the compensation for cattle plague?—Because the value of the diseased cow is lessened so much by the disease; and you must remember, also, that of the cattle killed to stamp out pleuro-pneumonia everything can be used. To give an example, here

Mr. *Assheton*—continued.

is an ox suffering from pleuro-pneumonia; the public authority says, "This ox must be killed;" then he is slaughtered, and the hide and the meat and all is sold, except the lungs, which must be destroyed; and to what the proprietor receives by selling the hide and meat, &c., so much is added as represents four-fifths of the actual value. It is not of so great avail to stamp out pleuro-pneumonia as it is to stamp out cattle plague, and we should not pay the whole value in cases of cattle plague if we were not of opinion that by paying the whole value as compensation we should induce the proprietor to give notice of the first case. We put the proprietor in a situation that he is glad to give notice at the first moment; therefore we pay also for the animals that have died by the disease.

1514. I will put it in another way if you will allow me. If you kill a cow suffering from cattle plague that is worth 15 *l.*, you pay the man 15 *l.*; if you kill a cow that is suffering from pleuro-pneumonia, how much would you pay?—£. 12.

1515. Why, in your opinion, is a man to get 15 *l.* for his cow if it is killed for one reason and only 12 *l.* if it is killed for another?—In the case of cattle plague we kill cattle which have been in contact with diseased cattle. In pleuro-pneumonia we kill only diseased cattle, and not healthy cattle, and diseased cattle is of smaller value than healthy cattle; therefore, when we pay four-fifths of the value it is more than the real value of the diseased cattle. When we pay compensation in cases of cattle plague on this principle of paying the whole value, we do it only to induce the proprietors to give notice at the first moment.

Chairman.

1516. It is simply as a bribe, in fact?—It is a prize given for giving notice.

Mr. *Assheton*.

1517. Do I understand you rightly, that you have no regulations at all about foot-and-mouth disease?—We have regulations, but the regulations are only as follows: we have notice that the foot-and-mouth disease has broken out on premises; we order the proprietor not to leave his premises with his cattle, or with his pigs, or in other words, we shut the diseased beasts in the premises; that is the only measure. To give you an example, we will suppose that a herd of cattle or pigs is going to market; if the veterinary inspector or police officer sees that those cattle or pigs have foot-and-mouth disease, he has the right to lay his hands on them and say, "You go no further; here I shut you up in such and such premises."

1518. Is an owner of cattle suffering from foot-and-mouth disease obliged to give notice of it?—He is; it is the same in all cases of contagious disease. Not only is the owner bound to give notice, but also the veterinary surgeon who is treating the diseased animals; the veterinary surgeon will be punished, and the owner also, if he does not give notice.

1519. I see in this morning's paper there is this paragraph: "A correspondent writes to us under date, Hamburg, May 31st, that foot-and-mouth disease in a virulent form has broken out near here amongst some grazing stock"; have you

Mr. *Assheton*—continued.

you heard of that?—No I have not. We have foot-and-mouth disease every year, and we cannot avoid it, because we have it time after time by the trade in pigs from Poland, and you can follow in Prussia the round of foot-and-mouth disease by following the pig trade.

Sir *Rainald Knightley.*

1520. Did I rightly understand you to say that cattle plague in sheep was very uncommon in Germany?—Very uncommon.

1521. I think you said that in the whole of your experience, you only knew one case of cattle plague in sheep?—Only one case in Emden, during the last outbreak, and that case was doubtful.

1522. Therefore, if the importation of German cattle into England were prohibited, sheep might be imported with no danger at all?—I see no danger. Now from Russia, sheep may be sent to the border districts, but under certain restrictions. The number of sheep that are introduced from Russia are very small, but when we shut our borders against Russia, if we allow sheep to come over our border districts, we prove by it that we have no great fear about the sheep.

1523. And you think that the sheep might be imported into England without any danger at all?—Yes.

Mr. *Elliot.*

1524. Has rinderpest ever been known to break out in Prussia without the introduction of foreign cattle?—Never.

1525. Have you seen any report that has been made to the Veterinary Department at Berlin, on the "Castor" case?—No.

1526. Do you know anything of that report (*handing a Paper to the Witness*)?—I do not know this report; I see it now for the first time, and I do not know who is the reporter.

1527. Has there been any report made from Hamburg to head quarters, in Berlin, in this case?—I do not know; I have not seen it at Berlin.

1528. In cases where there is an outbreak do not the authorities always have a report made as to the causes of the disease?—Yes, but I do not see every report that is made.

1529. It does not come before the Veterinary Department?—It does not come in every case before the Veterinary Department, because all the cases of cattle plague are not in the Prussian Veterinary Department, but are treated at the office of the Chancellor. It is quite a matter of the Chancellor's.

1530. Do you agree with the substance of this report?—No, I do not agree with it; it seems to be the excuse of the veterinary inspector.

1531. Do you not think that it is a very lame excuse?—It seems to be a very lame excuse.

Chairman.

1532. I understood you to say that the veterinary inspector had been already suspended?—He is suspended, and he is a ruined man for life, and I do pity him, poor man; he had a very good place; the other inspector, in Hamburg, is under trial; we call it a disciplinary trial.

1533. Is it a departmental trial by the minister?—It is; it is not punishment by a court of law.

1534. It is not a judicial trial, but a trial by his master?—By his master; by the minister.

Mr. *Elliot.*

1535. Do you allow manure or hides, or anything else likely to cause infection, to come across the frontier without inspection?—It is very seldom that cattle plague is carried by hay or straw, but manure is another thing. We allow hides to come if they are dried or salted; the drying is the best disinfection that you can have.

1536. I think I understood you to say that you would reduce the restrictions if there were no signs of disease on the frontier for some time, or if the Russian army was likely to be demobilised?—We should wait a long time before we should reduce our restrictions, because it is not to be trusted.

1537. Do you mean the restrictions now in force, or the former ones?—The general restrictions will be continued, and the more stringent restrictions will be kept up as long as it is possible, until we are convinced that there is no danger.

1538. Can you ever be convinced that there is no peril on the frontier of Russia?—We can now, because we have veterinary inspectors on our frontiers towards Russia and Poland, and we can better discover cattle plague there.

Mr. *Jacob Bright.*

1539. Germany is now a prohibited country so far as we are concerned, is it not?—It is.

1540. And we used to get large supplies of food from Germany?—Chiefly from Schleswig and Holstein.

1541. What becomes of those supplies now?—They are going to the great towns in Germany. You must not forget that your greatest supply is the supply from Schleswig-Holstein. The Schleswig-Holstein supply comes to England only in the times when the fattening on the great pastures goes on in the months of July, August, September, October, and until the beginning of November; and, therefore, Germany is not now suffering much from the prohibition, because of what you receive from Germany almost five-sixths is from Holstein.

1542. I suppose that much of the cattle that we should have got from Germany is now going to Paris, is it not?—I do not think it is. I believe that the French receive from Germany more sheep than cattle; the export of sheep to France is a very great one.

1543. I understand you to say that you have been very much strengthening the safeguards against disease in Germany?—We have tried to do so.

1544. And therefore you think that presently we ought to readmit your cattle and sheep?—I believe that you can admit them now without fear. If you ask me, I should say admit them, but order the German cattle, except the Schleswig cattle, to be slaughtered at Deptford. If I were in your place I would not give orders to let them go over the country; I would advise that all the cattle should be slaughtered in Deptford market, except the Schleswig-Holstein cattle.

1545. You think, in fact, that Germany ought to be a scheduled country, but not a prohibited country?—I think it ought to be a scheduled country, yet with the exception of Schleswig-Holstein, and not a prohibited country.

1546. Would you say that with regard to German sheep as well as German cattle?—No. I believe you might let the sheep go as from an unscheduled country. If you asked my advice upon

Professor *Müller.*

4 June 1877.

Professor *Müller*.

4 June 1877.

Mr. *Jacob Bright*—continued.

upon that, I would say that you can now put Germany in the same state as before the outbreak of cattle plague.

1547. With regard to sheep?—With regard to sheep, and also with regard to cattle.

1548. You say you would put it in the same state as it was in before the cattle plague. What was the state then; was Germany free or scheduled?—It was scheduled; I would not ask that Germany should be free as Spain and Portugal are; I would myself give the advice that the German cattle should be slaughtered in England always, with the exception of the Schleswig-Holstein cattle.

1549. You have stated, I think, that you have never known but one case of sheep having the cattle plague?—I have seen it in France several times, but not in Germany. In France I saw it in 1871 very often. It is very difficult to recognise cattle plague in sheep, and I have never seen in Germany one case in which cattle plague was spread by sheep.

1550. You do believe that cattle plague can be communicated by sheep?—I do believe it; but I have never seen it in Germany.

Mr. *Ritchie*.

1551. I think you said that you thought that we should adopt a wise course if we slaughtered the cattle at Deptford?—I did.

1552. Do you think that it would add greatly to the risk of carrying infection throughout the country to bring cattle up to the London market to slaughter?—I believe that you have no power to hinder cattle going from the London market into the country.

1553. But supposing that we had that power, do you not think that the transport from Deptford to London would increase the risk of carrying contagion?—If you disinfected the railway trucks at once after it, you might carry them.

1554. Does not everyone who comes in contact with cattle having the cattle plague, more or less, carry contagion wherever he goes?—Yes, but that is a very exceptional case; you have asked me if I would advise that cattle should be slaughtered at Deptford, and then you asked if we would do as you do in cases of cattle plague, that is to say, not allow living cattle to go from the market. Under those circumstances I see no great difference between the Islington market and Deptford; the only difference is the transport from the Islington market to Deptford. It is said that cattle plague might be spread by a man who is on the place; it is much talked about, but it is very seldom done; it is only conjectural.

1555. If the cattle were of more value alive in the London market than they could be at Deptford market, you would say let them go to London?—I would say let them go to London, under the presumption that the London market is closed against export.

1556. Was there any inspection of those cattle at Hamburg before they were shipped in the "Castor"?—There was; they were inspected twice in a day. The "Castor" left Hamburg on Friday the 12th of January, and they were inspected in the morning by the veterinary inspectors and also in the afternoon; in the morning, in the premises of the cattle traders, and in the evening, in the haven before loading in the ship, and the inspectors found nothing. In common

Mr. *Ritchie*—continued.

times I would have excused the veterinary inspectors if they had seen nothing by their examination. A veterinary inspector sees hundreds of cattle, one after another, and he will sometimes be a little superficial. That is only human. But I believe that the inspectors in Hamburg deserve punishment because they must have known that cattle plague was in Silesia; and under those circumstances, knowing that cattle plague was in Silesia, they ought to have been severer in their examinations.

1557. In point of fact, you do not think that the examination which now takes place is any safeguard at all?—I believe that only when the examination is made in such a superficial way as it was in the case of the "Castor."

1558. Your opinion is that the examination which does take place, and which has taken place, is so superficial as to be valueless?—I have not said that; you have not understood it rightly. I say that under the circumstances I would excuse it if in one case it is done a little superficially, because I think that is only human; but if a veterinary inspector knows that cattle plague is on the border, it is his duty to do the work in a very stringent manner.

1559. But this veterinary inspector, knowing that the cattle plague existed, even then made only a superficial examination?—Yes, and therefore he is removed from his office.

1560. There were two inspectors, were there not?—One is the Prussian inspector, and the other is the Hamburg inspector, and we can only judge about the Prussian inspector. In the case of the Prussian inspector the trial is finished; but the Hamburg inspector is yet under trial, and the judgment is not yet given.

1561. Do you know whether there is any intention of making regulations by which this examination would be made more effectual?—I believe that if it is wished that special regulations and distinct instructions should be given to those inspectors as to how the examination should be made, such instructions would be given.

1562. But you do not know whether anything is in contemplation?—I do not know because I have not asked, but if you like I will ask it. I understand your question to be whether it is not the intention of the highest Prussian authorities to give an instruction and strict regulation how examinations in the ports should be made, and I will inquire as to that.

Mr. *Pease*.

1563. Supposing Germany was not scheduled, would the quantity of cattle coming from Germany be very much increased?—I do not believe that the quantity of cattle would be very much increased; but I believe that the import of sheep would be very much increased. I have no great experience of these questions which are questions of trade, but you receive from Germany, I believe, on an average, about 70,000 head of cattle in the year; and of this average number, four-fifths or five-sixths are Schleswig cattle.

1564. You described, I think, to the Right honourable Member the closing of the cattle market, and you said that the fat cattle coming in to Berlin were all slaughtered, and nothing went back again into the country; but when a market is closed is there a movement allowed in the country of lean cattle from farm to farm?—

It

Mr. *Pease*—continued.

It is allowed in districts which are free from cattle plague.

1565. Without any restriction? — Without any restriction. The great markets for slaughtering purposes are our peril. The peril is that in a great centre are assembled cattle from all parts of the kingdom, and therefore we must shut those markets on the first case of cattle plague being found out, in Silesia, or in another rural district, I believe, that by this measure to shut every cattle market in the great towns on the same day when the first case of cattle plague is detected in any village in the country we have the best means of protecting our own land, and also the neighbouring countries.

Mr. *M'Lagan.*

1566. I think that you stated that you did not think that there was much risk in an individual carrying cattle plague from one place to another? —No, from my experience the possibility cannot be denied, but I think it is not so often the case as it is said to be; for I must draw your attention to the fact that going through the air a certain distance is the best disinfection you can find. The peril is that an individual may carry manure on his shoes, and by means of this manure he can, I believe, take the cattle plague over a great distance; but in his clothes, I believe, it is not to be done.

1567. Do you make the same remark as regards dogs; do you think that dogs cannot carry the infection?—I believe that they can, because they may carry manure on their feet; and the hair also is very hygroscopic, and it can retain the infecting matter. Therefore we have it laid down in our laws and regulations that in all places infected by cattle plague, dogs must be bound in their lair by a chain; and if a dog is seen running freely in the place where cattle plague exists he is shot.

1568. Then if a dog will carry infection in its hair, live cattle coming from an infected country will also carry the infection in their hair, will they not, though they are not infected themselves at the time?—No doubt, and that is the great peril by sheep, for sheep can have it in their wool.

1569. You have seen sheep affected, I suppose, by cattle plague? — I have seen it in France.

1570. Then do you think that there is no risk in bringing live cattle to this country and having them slaughtered at Deptford?—I see no peril whatever in that, if only your regulations at Deptford are in good order. It is clearly proved that you have had cattle plague by bringing diseased animals to Deptford, but it is your fault that you have let the disease go out from Deptford.

1571. But supposing that there was a vessel in which diseased cattle had been carried on a previous voyage, and that that vessel had not been properly disinfected, and that it went to a clean port, and sound cattle were put on board that vessel and brought over to Deptford, is there not a risk of her bringing the disease to this country then?—The boat must be disinfected in a sufficient manner.

1572. What regulation would you suggest for disinfecting that boat?—I would destroy as much as possible all the wood that had been in contact with cattle and with cattle manure.

Mr. *M'Lagan*—continued.

1573. Then you would say that there is a risk, even in bringing over sound cattle, that the disease may be brought over to this country if the infection was in the boat?—If the infection was in the boat; but we have a law in Germany that every ship and every railway truck that has been used for cattle must be disinfected in a strict manner.

1574. Whether they carry diseased or sound cattle?—In all times. That is also a law of the empire and not only for Prussia.

1575. That will meet the case, you think?—That will meet the case.

1576. How soon can you discover the disease upon an animal after it has been infected?—On the fifth or sixth day as a rule, but it may go to the ninth day.

1577. Then there is the risk that, although examined and passed at Hamburg and found to be perfectly sound, the animals may show symptoms of disease before they come to Deptford?—Yes, it is possible, but it has not occurred. It is possible that the inspectors may have seen nothing at all, because the disease was what we call in the stage of incubation between the infection and the outbreak of the disease, and in such a case no inspector in the world can see any disease. But the "Castor" was on its way from Hamburg to Deptford from Friday evening to Monday morning, and in that time the cattle plague could not get so far as that one of the cattle was dying on the sea, and one was dying on arriving here in London. The incubation of cattle plague lasts five or six days at least; and when one of the cattle is dying by cattle plague in the same day or the day after, then the symptoms must have been of such an area that a good examination would have found out that the cattle were not healthy. They are saying as their excuse, that they saw that one or two of the cattle were ill with the foot and mouth disease, and that they had retained those cattle that were so ill.

1578. You say that there is some risk in bringing over live cattle to Deptford of their bringing the disease here; are you still of opinion that the best plan would be to bring them over and slaughter them at that port?—I would consider that to be the best plan.

1579. Have you ever considered what would be the loss to Germany if the cattle were slaughtered in Germany instead of being brought over alive and slaughtered at Deptford?—We have as yet no experience about it; I can only form a judgment after the various experiments that are made on the Austro-Russian border, and also on our Russian border, to slaughter the cattle and to bring the dead meat to our great towns; that is quite similar to your case, and we have seen that all those experiments have failed.

1580. Could you give the Committee any idea as to the loss per head of slaughtering cattle before importation as compared with slaughtering them after they have been brought over here?—No; but I can only state that in Austria there is a law about slaughter-houses on the border, and all those slaughtering houses that were destined to bring dead meat from the Russo-Galician frontier to Vienna have failed without an exception; and we are of opinion that all those ar-

Professor *Müller*.

4 June 1877.

Mr. *L'Logan*—continued.

rangements to bring over dead meat from a great distance are likely to fail; it is very difficult to sell the offal with advantage; if you have great slaughtering-houses you must have industries for the hides and also tanneries; you must have industries to dispose of the manure, of the tripes, of the feet, of the horns, and of the lesser portions of the cattle. Those are not made in one year, and I believe that it will be a long time before all those industries can be put in operation; then also I fear that meat is too dear in Germany for there to be a trade in that meat; meat in Germany is not much cheaper than it is here in London; I believe in Berlin, meat is dearer than it is in London, and therefore it is not possible to arrange for such a trade; you receive our best cattle from Schleswig, and I believe that it would make a very great difference if Schleswig sold the cattle in another place.

Mr. *Chamberlain*.

1581. I think you told the Committee that you had a census taken of all the live cattle?—Yes, in the prescribed zone; and the landowner would be punished if he gave false notices.

1582. Does that exist only in districts in which the disease has occurred?—It exists in all diseased districts; in the last outbreak it existed in the whole country, but now it exists only in the border provinces.

1583. Then the moment the disease breaks out you ask for this return?—Yes, in all the provinces where the cattle plague breaks out.

1584. Does that apply only where there is cattle plague, or does it apply where there is pleuro-pneumonia?—Only in cases of cattle plague.

1585. Under such circumstances the animals are not allowed to be bought or sold without an order?—Not without an order, and without making a note of it in the return, or census as you call it; I call it the cataster.

1586. Is there any similar restriction in parts of the country which are not infected?—No.

1587. The trade is perfectly free?—The trade is perfectly free; it is only a measure of restriction in infected districts, or in such districts which we fear may be infected. I believe it is so put down more clearly.

Colonel *Kingscote*.

1588. Is the Veterinary Department at Hamburg under the control of the Veterinary Department at Berlin?—It is not; Hamburg is a free State.

1589. As Hamburg is not included in your regulations, can you tell the Committee what regulations are in force there in the case of cattle plague?—Quite the same as in Prussia; for the law against cattle plague is not a Prussian law, but it is a law of the Empire, and the law against cattle plague has quite the same meaning in all Germany.

1590. But supposing that there is no cattle plague, what then?—Then the Hamburg State has its own laws. It is a free State, and I can only say that the Hamburg laws concerning pleuro-pneumonia are yet more stringent than the Prussian laws. They are killing more in cases of pleuro-pneumonia than we are killing. We are killing only the diseased animals; but under the Hamburg laws the cattle in contact

Colonel *Kingscote*—continued.

with diseased animals are killed in cases of pleuro-pneumonia.

1591. Do you consider that rinderpest, cattle plague, pleuro-pneumonia, foot-and-mouth disease, sheep pox, or sheep scab, ever originated spontaneously in Western Europe?—No, never. We are of opinion that all contagious diseases of cattle are only spread by contagion, and that they do not make their appearance by spontaneous generation.

1592. Do you think it would be possible under proper regulations to exterminate these diseases from an island like Great Britain?—That is a question which is very difficult to answer.

Chairman.

1593. I have understood you already to say that you believe the regulations which you adopt will stamp out pleuro-pneumonia?—I believe so; but I am now asked, as I understand, whether I consider it possible that these contagious diseases not originating spontaneously may be stamped out in England, which is an island. I do not know the English circumstances sufficiently to answer the question; but if I should give an answer only scientifically or theoretically, I should say that I cannot deny the possibility of stamping out every contagious disease by proper regulations. But I do not believe, according to my knowledge of the English circumstances, that it will be possible in England. For stamping out these contagious diseases in animals would necessitate changes in all your administration. Stamping out diseases among animals needs a despotic power.

Colonel *Kingscote*.

1594. You have said that it could not be done in your country, and you think that it would be still more difficult to do it here?—We have our difficulties, and I believe you will have more difficulties than we have. I believe that no Englishman would tolerate such measures as we take to stamp out pleuro-pneumonia and glanders.

1595. And yet you do not succeed?—We did not succeed till now, and we are ever combating against it. Then, I would remark, that it is our great misfortune that we have not enough good veterinary surgeons who can be trusted with all these matters, and we must lay great powers in the hands of such men. Where would you find the veterinary staff necessary to stamp out all these diseases; and the veterinary officers to whom you could give such enormous powers? I do not believe that you will find them in England.

1596. What is your opinion of our measures of the veterinary police as compared with yours; do you think ours are as efficient as yours?—No. Here I must speak as a German. I cannot find a word for your measures. You have no measures at all, in my opinion.

1597. It is what we should call higgledy-piggledy?—I do not know what you are saying; but if I tell you the truth, I should wonder that you have succeeded at all with your measures.

1598. Can you tell us what are the expenses of your Veterinary Department in Germany as compared with ours?—I cannot tell you very rightly as compared with yours; I do not know how much you pay.

1599. How are your towns supplied with milk in

Colonel *Kingscote*—continued.

in Germany; have you dairies in the towns or in the country?—There is quite a difference in different towns. To give you an example; in Vienna it is similar to London; in Vienna you have in the town a great number, many hundreds of dairies. In Berlin you have very few dairies; we do not like the dairies in the towns.

1600. Do you find that pleuro-pneumonia and other diseases emanate very much from the dairies?—The dairies near the great towns are the hotbeds of pleuro-pneumonia, because in Germany it is quite a custom in all such dairies that they are for ever buying and selling cows; they buy cows fresh milking, and then they milk them to a certain point, and then they sell the cows to the butchers.

1601. Have you any special regulations with respect to the management of the dairies?—No; we have no express regulation, but we receive almost all our milk in Berlin from great distances by railway. We have very few dairies in the town.

Mr. *Arthur Peel*.

1602. Are all the inspectors in Germany now Imperial inspectors?—The whole are Prussians, Bavarians, and Saxons, &c.; but we have inspectors in all German States, with the exception of only two, Mecklenburg and Brunswick.

1603. Do those inspectors act under any regulations from any central department?—They act under the regulations of the laws of the Empire, or under the laws of their own States; thus, the Bavarian inspector is acting under Bavarian laws, but in cases of rinderpest he is acting under the laws of the Empire.

1604. In cases of rinderpest the laws under which all the inspectors act are the same?—Yes, but not in the case of pleuro-pneumonia; then they are acting under the laws of their own State. There are only two little States where they have no veterinary officer. Mecklenburg and Brunswick have no veterinary organisation.

1605. Can you tell the Committee the date of the smuggling of the diseased animals over the frontier to Breslau?—I do not know the date exactly.

1606. Have there been any regulations since that?—No; since that there was a military cordon on the frontier, but it is now retired; it was retired, I believe, in the second half of the month of April.

1607. Then what security has Germany that smuggled cattle cannot now be introduced over the frontier?—Because it is our intention to prevent the smuggling of cattle to avoid rinderpest, by the most stringent measures I have mentioned.

1608. Cannot they now be smuggled over in the same way as before?—No, they cannot, because the number of policemen and of custom-house officers has been much increased.

1609. I suppose you regard your regulations against the introduction of cattle from Russia as permanent laws?—They have lasted now for six years, and I believe they will be perpetual.

1610. They will never be taken off?—No, never.

1611. Does Russia take any precautions against the disease?—No; there are very good laws, but they are laws on paper, and almost nothing is done in Russia.

Mr. *Arthur Peel*—continued.

1612. You said that it was more easy to detect the disease in the living than in the dead animals; do you believe that it is possible to detect the disease in the dead carcase in the butcher's shop?—I take it to be impossible to detect it in the meat without seeing the organs.

1613. Do you or do you not agree with Professor Brown who said that disease could be communicated by a dead carcase?—That is very often the case; if you asked me what is the greatest risk of spreading cattle plague, I would say that, in the first place, it is live cattle; in the second place, it is dead meat; and in the third place it is manure. We have seen in Germany very often the spreading of cattle plague by dead meat; the first cases in villages are sometimes not found out, and the peasantry slaughter the first diseased oxen or cows, and then they sell the meat, and we have very often found that the only cause for cattle plague spreading in a village was the selling of the meat of a diseased ox.

1614. Does that meat come into contact with a living animal?—Very often. It is the custom of our peasantry to put the water that has been used in washing meat in the washtub, and the cattle are fed very often in Germany from the washtub, and that is the best means to propagate cattle plague if the meat was that of diseased cattle.

1615. Do you, as a veterinary authority, believe that the dead meat of an animal in which the disease has been incubating, when it is killed is deleterious as human food?—No, there has never been a case known in which the meat of cattle diseased by cattle plague was infectious to human beings.

1616. But it could infect other cattle?—It could infect other cattle, and it could infect also perhaps sheep or other ruminants, for, as I said, dead meat from a railway car infected the animals in the Jardin d'Acclimatization.

1617. You said, did you not, that you considered it necessary to slaughter all German cattle at the port of Deptford?—Except the Schleswig cattle. If you ask my advice as to what you should do with the German cattle, under the present circumstances, I should say slaughter them at Deptford.

1618. Is the danger that you apprehend that the disease may be incubating during the transit?—The transit from Germany to London lasts, I believe, three days, and the cattle must be brought from the eastern provinces to the port of shipping to England, and that will be longer than the period of incubation.

1619. Then, when you said that German cattle must be slaughtered at Deptford, you were thinking mainly of pleuro-pneumonia?—And also of foot-and-mouth disease; and you will have a greater security against those.

1620. In Germany, you take no security, or very little security, agsinst pleuro-pneumonia?—We cannot do it, because of our long land frontier, but we have prohibited the import of cattle from the Netherlands.

1621. But if cattle plague only was in question, you would say that we might admit living German cattle free?—Yes, because when cattle plague is found out in Germany our measures are most stringent.

Professor *Müller*.

4 June 1877.

Mr. *Chaplin*.

1622. I understand that the precautions that you take upon your frontier are permanent, and as strict as possible?—They are.

1623. But in spite of all these precautions you run considerable risk of importing cattle plague into Germany?—By a fraudulent way; by smuggling.

1624. Would anything short of the prohibition of the importation of live cattle into Germany free you altogether from the risk of cattle plague?—We have a prohibition of the importation from Russia of cattle of all races, and from Austria of all cattle of the grey steppe race; and we allow only to be introduced cattle of other races from Austria under certain restrictions I have mentioned.

1625. Do you import dead meat?—We have tried to import dead meat, but I have already stated that all our experiments to organise a trade in dead meat on our eastern frontier have been unsuccessful; and I have stated that in Austria it is quite the same, for Austria is not less anxious than we are to avoid cattle plague from Russia, and therefore Austria has long had a law about slaughtering-houses on the Russian frontier. But all was done without success, and they have now no means of slaughtering cattle on their frontier; it was an experiment that has not succeeded.

Mr. *Chaplin*—continued.

1626. Then you run a certain amount of risk from the cattle being smuggled into the country?—That is our greatest risk.

1627. Is it considerable?—It is very considerable in Upper Silesia, and it is a very well-organised smuggling; but we believe that this peril can be avoided by the measure which I sought to demonstrate on the map with the pins which I stuck in. We have now a district round the Russian frontier, where no cattle can be loaded in railway-cars; or, to say it in other words, we have given up certain of our border districts to protect the other parts of the country.

1628. Then if we in England were to import cattle from Germany, we, I suppose, should undergo a certain proportion of the risk which you yourselves run?—You must rely to a certain extent upon the efficacy of the German measures.

Mr. Thomas Swan, called in; and Examined.

Mr. *Swan*.

Chairman.

1629. I believe you are a Live Stock Agent in Edinburgh?—I am.

1630. What length of time have you been in that business?—Our business began in 1842, and my brother and I joined the firm in 1856.

1631. Can you tell the Committee what the nature of the business is?—We have a large home connection; we sell a great many home cattle, as well as cattle from Ireland and the continent of Europe, and all the American cattle through Messrs. John Bell & Sons, that have come to Scotland. Last year we sold 32,930 cattle, and 175,000 sheep and lambs.

1632. Was that all derived from Ireland or America?—There are 22,058 of those that were home cattle (I mean by that English and Scotch cattle), and there were 2,977 from Ireland, and 7,895 from the Continent, exclusively from Denmark and Sweden. Then we had 171,254 home sheep, and we had 3,796 foreign sheep.

1633. Were these sheep also from Denmark?—We had some from America.

1634. In the course of your business, do you ever have cargoes from other parts of Europe than Denmark, Norway, and Sweden?—We used to get a great many from Hamburg.

1635. Do you deal also in Schleswig-Holstein cattle?—We never have any from Schleswig-Holstein into Scotland; I have seen them, but we have never had any of them. We had a great many from Holland during the time when the ports were open.

1636. Can you give the Committee any idea of what the consumption has been during the last few years?—Yes; I applied to several of the principal market-keepers to see the increase in the number of cattle shown at three periods of five years each. In 1866 the number of cattle in Edinburgh was 18,494; in 1871 it was 36,693; in 1876 it was 39,264. At Glasgow, in 1866, there were 48,294; in 1871 there were 67,131; and in 1876 there were 73,717. At Liverpool there were, in 1866, 112,980; in 1871 there were 122,643; and in 1876 there were 126,074.

Chairman—continued.

1637. How did you procure those figures?—I got them from the official books of the market inspectors, in Glasgow excepted, where the numbers are given by the jacksman.

1638. Those are the official numbers as recorded?—Yes. Then in Newcastle, in 1866, there were 45,209 cattle; in 1871 there were 62,846; and in 1876 there were 103,794.

1639. Proving the increased consumption?—Yes; in Manchester there were, in 1866, 100,610 cattle; in 1871 there were 124,962; and in 1876 there were 167,846.

1640. Are you referring to those figures as the import into this country of foreign cattle?—No, those are the whole quantities shown.

1641. Can you show at all how the consumption of imported cattle has increased?—No; I can only say that at Newcastle, out of the total number of 103,000 shown last year, something like 43,000 were foreign cattle.

1642. Have you seen a large increase in the importation from countries from which you take foreign stock?—Our importations from Denmark have very materially increased within the last few years.

1643. Have the prices increased?—The prices have been gradually going up.

1644. With the introduction of a larger supply?—Yes.

1645. How has the establishment of the compulsory slaughter at ports affected the trade since you have been in business?—At Leith we can get no German cattle, because we have not a defined port of slaughter. The importation of live-stock into Scotland from those scheduled countries is prohibited altogether. If they come at all, they must come as meat, and we have not had any.

1646. Is that by the local arrangements?—It is by the local arrangements, I presume, and also because no cattle are allowed to come alive from Germany at all at present.

1647. But during the time that you have been in the trade you have experienced periods in which

Chairman—continued.

which Germany has been treated as a scheduled country, have you not?—Yes.

1648. During that time did you import cattle at all from Germany?—Yes, largely.

1649. Since that import has been stopped have you found any great want of the cattle from those districts, or has the demand been supplied from other places?—The demand in Scotland has been supplied from other places. We have drawn more cattle, for example, from the feeding districts of Scotland, and of course the demand has been increasing, and we have had a great many live cattle from America and other places.

1650. Under those circumstances, do you think that the protection supposed to be derived from the compulsory slaughter at those ports is one that is necessary for the trade?—So far as regards the slaughter at the ports of debarkation, I do not think that it is protective as to scheduled countries at all, in regard to the health of the stock of this country. Of course, as a natural result, we cannot make nearly so much for the carcases of the animals coming into the market as we can make for them when they come alive.

1651. But in the interests of the salesmen the profit of course is greatest upon the live animal than it is where the animal has to be slaughtered at a particular point?—I am not speaking in the interest of the salesmen with regard to this, because the remuneration to the salesman would be the same in either case; in fact, relatively more in carcase; but we can regulate the markets much more readily and make more of the cattle when they come to the market alive than we can do when they come in carcases, because it is a perishable article, and it has not an actual value attached to it during weather such as this, for example.

1652. With regard to the American meat trade, then, you have had a dead meat trade set up?—A very large trade, to Glasgow.

1653. Has it been continued for any length of time?—It began just this week last year.

1654. Then it went through the summer months?—It did.

1655. Can you speak of the quantities that were imported?—Perfectly. Sometimes as many as 500 carcases of meat a week to Glasgow.

1656. Was that during the hot weather?—No. At first the quantity would be from 50 to 100 carcases per week.

1657. During the months of July, August and September?—Yes, up to about the 1st of November.

1658. How did they arrive in Glasgow; did they arrive under peculiar circumstances of the atmosphere; that is to say, in these new refrigerators?—Yes.

1659. And did you find that those cargoes which arrived during the hot weather arrived in such a condition that you could make a market of them?—They vary very considerably. Sometimes they will make 7 *d.* a lb. to-day, and to-morrow they will only make 3 *d.*, according to condition and weather.

1660. You mean not the same cargo, but separate cargoes?—I saw a cargo sold a fortnight ago on Thursday, in Glasgow Market, and the prices began at about 4¾ *d.* for fore-quarters of beef, and 6¼ *d.* for hind-quarters, and before the sale had finished it was selling at 3 *d.* a lb. out of the same ship.

Chairman—continued.

1661. Was that in consequence of the meat deteriorating from atmospheric causes, or was it because of a glut in the market?—It was partly attributable to the weather, and there was more beef there than the trade could do with at the time.

1662. But the reduction in the price was not all to be put down to the fact of deterioration in the meat?—Not at all.

1663. Having now for many months had to deal with this imported dead meat from America, in your opinion is it a source on which you are able to rely?—No.

1664. Do you separate the hot weather from the cold in that answer?—I am speaking principally of the hot weather. It might continue to come during the winter months, but it is not in such favour in Scotland as it used to be.

1665. And that you believe is in consequence of its uncertainty during the hot weather?—If it is sold at once it looks very well for, perhaps, a day afterwards, but in the course of a day or two afterwards, it decays and loses bloom, and smells badly.

1666. Do you think that that system could be applied to importation from the Continent?—I do not think so.

1667. In coming from the Continent, the period for which it would be kept in this cold chamber, would be less than in the case when it comes from America?—No doubt.

1668. Notwithstanding that, you are not prepared from your experience to say, that it would afford a condition of trade upon which you could rely. We could not rely upon importations of meat in carcase from the Continent.

1669. I suppose that there is a certain amount of depreciation of live stock in transit?—It depends upon from whence they come. From America of course there must be, to some extent, some depreciation in weight, but in the last two cargoes of cattle that we had, which was this last week, we had every bullock landed alive that was shipped. There were 316 of them. I suppose there may be a slight depreciation in cattle coming from America, but cattle coming from the continent I should think, do not perceptibly deteriorate at all, either in weight or value.

1670. What would you give as the relative results, to the consumers and producers, of shipments of live stock as compared with carcases?—With regard to the relative values, in the case of American cattle: first, the price of American cattle in Glasgow last week, we may take at 8½ *d.* or 8¾ *d.* per lb. alive sinking the offal, leaving the beef to stand the butcher in 7¾ *d.*; I allow 1 *d.* a lb. for offal. The beef sent, belonging to the same consigners, was selling last week at an average of 5¾ *d.* per lb., so that the butchers were willing to give 2 *d.* per lb. more for meat of their own killing, from the same country, than for meat which is killed over on the other side.

1671. It was 2 *d.* per lb. in favour of the live animals?—Yes; the expense of transit would be about 3 *l.* 10 *s.* more on the live meat than on carcase meat; but taking the whole cost together, I should say that the amount of money in ordinary cases in favour of the live bullock, is something like 3 *l.* The shipper would receive 3 *l.* more than if it came in the carcase.

1672. The freight is 3 *l.* more?—Yes. In the first place, in regard to the live cattle there is no

Mr. *Swan.*

4 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

machinery necessary, of course. A live bullock makes 2 *d.* per lb. more in this country, but the expense of fetching it is something like 3 *l.* more than the expense of its coming in carcase, and the balance in favour of the live bullock is something like 3 *l.* or 3 *l.* 10 *s.*, deducting the 3 *l.* excess of expenses.

1673. You spoke of the Danish cattle as part of your import. Can you give the proportion of Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian cattle that are sold to be fattened here?—We do not receive many store cattle from those countries, but we sell a great many of them during the latter months of the year to the farmers. They buy them out of the fat market and fatten them.

1674. From those countries?—Yes.

1675. Will you give the proportion of the number that come over for that purpose?—I should think that during the months of August, September, and October we should sell perhaps 10 per cent. of them to farmers to feed.

1676. Is that a growing trade, because it is only recently that they have attempted to send them over for that purpose?—They do not even send them for that purpose now, but they come cheaper relatively than lean Irish cattle; they have always some condition upon them and they feed pretty well, and our farmers are beginning to like them better than they used to do. Every shipment now we have a good many calving cows, from 50 to 100 a-week, from those countries which we sell to the dairymen. Those are sent in for dairy purposes.

1677. Do they send them in from Denmark for dairy purposes?—Very largely.

1678. I understood you to say that there was an increased proportion of cattle sent in from Denmark and Sweden; can you separate those which are sent over for slaughter as fat beasts and those which come either for store or dairy purposes?—I should think that the proportion of Danish bullocks sold throughout the year would be something like 5 per cent. of the number coming, and I should think that on an average the number of dairy cows is something like 30 or 40 a-week.

1679. A witness from Denmark who has been examined before this Committee stated that almost their entire export was for slaughtering purposes?—So they are; but a good many are bought by farmers and others.

1680. Are they bought out of the fat stock market?—Yes; they are all shown together.

1681. Is that a recent trade?—No, it has been going on for some time. We have sold a good many of them every year for that purpose; we feed a lot of them ourselves, in fact.

1682. Then to a certain extent the farmers are dependent upon that import?—The number is not sufficient to make much difference, supposing that we were deprived of the cattle for that purpose.

1683. As to the countries which are at present scheduled, I thought I understood you to say that it would be a great advantage if the cattle were not ordered to be slaughtered at the ports?—It would.

1684. How would you deal with them there?—In the case of a country where there was no disease, or where our Government had security that the disease would not be imported from that country, I should recommend that they should have free admission here; and where the cattle plague is raging, or where any contagious or infectious disease of that kind exists, I would slaughter them on the other side.

Chairman—continued.

1685. You think that, with regard to an unscheduled country where cattle plague did not exist, there should be no restriction as to cattle circulating?—Certainly not.

1686. But as soon as cattle plague broke out, you would prohibit their entry altogether?—I would.

1687. And if they are slaughtered at all, you think that they should be slaughtered on the other side?—I think so.

1688. Are you able to speak at all as to the danger of import from Germany, and those other countries from which it is at present prohibited?—So far as I know, the health of the stock in Germany is good, and the precautions that they are taking are of the most complete kind; and it appears to me that the consumption of beef in this country is increasing so rapidly, and we are so unable to feed the people, that we should allow those countries from which there is no risk of disease to send their cattle into Great Britain, and where the slightest risk of any such diseases was likely to arise, I would keep them out altogether.

1689. Considering that the cattle plague has been introduced twice already into this country without our knowing of its having broken out abroad, do you think it would ever be possible to arrive at such a state of things as to enable you to have sufficiently early information as to an outbreak?—There is certainly a risk of that kind; but those governments are getting more alive to the necessity, and they are better able to cope with the difficulty than they were formerly. It is their interest to keep down diseases the same as it is ours; and if they can send us healthy stock, and satisfy the Government that they are so, I should certainly allow them to do it.

1690. Then, in fact, you would depend upon a sort of international arrangement between the countries, and you would admit the cattle free unless you had notice of the disease existing?—Yes.

1691. With regard to the complaints that exist as to the health of our home stock, can you suggest anything?—I do not think that the country was ever freer from disease than it is at the present moment.

1692. Are you speaking of Scotland?—Yes, and of Ireland as well, and of England too.

1693. Do you mean with regard to pleuro-pneumonia and foot and mouth disease?—Yes; we have, of course, always in Edinburgh a certain proportion of pleuro-pneumonia in the dairies.

1694. Do you arrive at that opinion from the fewness of the cases that have occurred under your own notice?—Yes; and we have information from all over the country in regard to that.

1695. Have you any dairies in Glasgow and Edinburgh?—Yes, a great many.

1696. Have you had many cases of pleuro-pneumonia in those dairies?—Pleuro-pneumonia is always occurring there. The dairies both in Edinburgh and in Glasgow are licensed by the magistrates to hold so many cows, and of course they are subject to inspection by the market inspector, who goes round occasionally.

1697. Are they allowed to move their animals freely

Chairman—continued.

freely into and out of those dairies?—Where they are clear from disease they are.

1698. They are only allowed to move them when the inspector has passed them as being free from disease?—Exactly; and if a case of disease arises they are not allowed to move them.

1699. And yet you say that pleuro-pneumonia is rife amongst those dairies?—It breaks out occasionally.

1700. And they are a source of considerable danger, I suppose, to the general stock of cattle in the country?—If the disease is there, there must always be a certain risk of course; but where disease exists, no movement is permitted until 28 clear days after its disappearance.

1701. But summing up your evidence, you are in favour of taking off the restrictions and trusting to international communications as between the different countries for protecting us from the importation of disease?—I am.

1702. And you do not believe that the introduction of the American dead meat trade will be sufficiently lasting to enable us to rely upon it for the food of the people?—That is my opinion.

Mr. *Arthur Peel.*

1703. What has been the condition of the Irish cattle that have come under your notice in Edinburgh?—The Irish cattle that came to us last year were on many occasions very bad with foot and mouth disease.

1704. Where would they come from?—From Dublin, principally.

1705. Was there any kind of inspection exercised over them?—Yes.

1706. Where?—At the Broomielaw, at Glasgow, on the Clyde.

1707. You do not agree with Professor Brown, one of the witnesses before this Committee, who anticipated a large development in the dead meat trade?—I think it will fall off; it is impossible to work.

1708. What is the state of the dead meat trade between Scotland and London?—In the winter season a good many cattle and sheep come from Scotland here as dead meat; but I should say that it is a very dangerous experiment for the sender in the summer months.

1709. Is that traffic in dead meat from Scotland to London increasing?—It is developed nearly as far as it can be, I think. There has always been a very extensive trade between Scotland and London in beef from Aberdeen, and sheep from all over the country.

1710. You would prefer the cattle being slaughtered at the port of embarkation rather than at the port of arrival?—If they come from a country from which they are likely to bring cattle plague, I should.

1711. I suppose that there would be a greater risk with regard to the dead meat, would there not, if it had to undergo the long voyage as well?—Certainly.

1712. You said that one of the great evils of the dead meat trade was the change in value, inasmuch as it drops from 7 *d.* in one day to 3 *d.* the next day?—Quite so; you cannot tell its value at all.

1713. I suppose that would operate with greater effect if the cattle were slaughtered in a foreign port?—Certainly.

Colonel *Kingscote.*

Mr. *Swan.*

4 June 1877.

1714. Do you confine yourself to the sale of live stock, or do you sell dead meat also?—We used to sell dead meat when the markets were closed during the time when the prohibition of the movement of live stock was in force.

1715. How long ago was that?—It would be in 1865 or in 1866, I think, when the markets were all stopped.

1716. Then for the last two or three years you have had no experience of the dead meat market?—Only by seeing it regularly sold in Edinburgh and Glasgow.

1717. But I understand that you have never had any experience in the sale of dead meat?—No; not since 1866. I have never sold any of it myself, but I have seen it sold weekly.

1718. And you think that it is carried out at such a loss that it will not continue?—That is my opinion.

1719. Are you aware that at the present moment there are projects to bring dead meat from Vienna and even from as far as Australia?—I have heard so.

1720. Do you think that those schemes would be mooted if there was not a fair chance of success?—There may be, but I should not like to be a partner with them. I think that this country can never be supplied with food by dead meat and carcases with any degree of certainty.

1721. You would sooner run the risk of the animals being knocked about in a storm than have the dead meat brought over?—Out of 7,000 cattle that we had last year from Denmark, we had only 18 casualties altogether.

1722. But is not the proportion of casualty and injury greater in the case of cattle coming from America?—There is a greater risk in the case of cattle coming from America on account of the distance, and there is also greater risk in importing live cattle from America, of course, than in importing them from the continent of Europe.

1723. You say that there is a great quantity of pleuro-pneumonia in the dairies of Edinburgh and Glasgow?—Yes, occasionally.

1724. Do you think that any regulations would prevent that, or would you like to see any regulations with regard to it?—I do not think that any regulations would cope with that, because the ventilation and the situation of so many of them are productive of disease; that is to say, no restrictions with regard to movement would prevent disease breaking out periodically.

1725. If you prohibited dairies in these large towns, would not that have a tendency to prevent disease being spread in other directions?—I think that it would be a good thing.

Mr. *Chamberlain.*

1726. You say that the loss of the German supply has been made up from Scotland and other places?—The loss has been made up in Scotland by drawing from other places.

1727. From other countries?—Yes. As our supply from Germany decreases, of course we are able to sell more Danes.

1728. Has the loss of the German supply affected the price in any way?—With our markets increasing in numbers every year for the last 10 years the prices to the public just now, notwithstanding American meat, are higher than they have been on the average during that period.

1729. Do you connect that with the loss of the German supply?—No; but I wish to show the

Mr. *Swan.*

4 June 1877.

Mr. *Chamberlain*—continued.

the Committee the necessity of encouraging a supply of healthy stock sufficient to meet the requirements of the people, without the risk of disease.

1730. You say that you would slaughter the animals at the port of embarkation in case the country is infected; do you mean infected by cattle plague?—If cattle plague is raging in any country, I would have the cattle killed upon the other side, and not allow them to come here alive at all.

1731. Would you apply that to pleuro-pneumonia?—I would not think so much of that unless it were epidemic in any foreign country.

1732. If it applied to pleuro-pneumonia, Germany would be permanently under that prohibition, would it not?—Yes; cattle plague I should certainly exclude altogether, because I cannot see the safety that this country enjoys if cattle come from the continent with cattle plague upon them. At Deptford, for example, it is no security against disease; it might be spread there very readily.

1733. Do you know whether there are any restrictions in force now upon the movement of cattle in any part of Scotland?—None whatever; they are perfectly free.

Mr. *M'Lagan.*

1734. I suppose that in your business as a cattle agent you have a larger return from selling imported live stock than from selling imported dead meat?—When we were selling meat in the carcase we charged more commission than we do in the live trade.

1735. Have you ever thought which would be the more profitable to the cattle salesman, selling live stock or selling dead meat?—I should think that he would get more profit out of the dead beef than he would out of the live animal.

1736. Therefore it is a matter of indifference to you whether we import live stock, or whether we import dead meat?—Perfectly. If all foreign importations came slaughtered, of course we should require to sell them in carcase instead of selling them alive.

1737. I think you said that the carcase of an animal brings less money than the live animal itself?—It does; the values are not relative.

1738. Therefore for a cattle salesman to get the same profit he would either require a larger commission upon the carcase than he would have upon the live stock, or he must have a great many more carcases sent?—Yes.

1739. And therefore the cattle salesman would require to raise his commission upon all dead meat that came into the country to put him into the same position as the same number of cattle were imported?—The commission is higher already.

1740. You spoke about the Danish cattle; is the number of Danish cows imported on the increase?—No; I think we have sold more in former years than we have sold this.

1741. They were generally used, not for feeding purposes, as I understand, but for dairy purposes?—Yes, for dairy purposes.

1742. Are you aware how the farmers in Scotland like them?—I have sold a good many of them during harvest time, and they do not object to them, so far as I know.

1743. They generally come over in calf, do they not?—Yes, and some of them in milk.

Mr. *M'Lagan*—continued.

1744. But you think that that has not been on the increase?—No, I do not think that it has. In fact, as you know, in Scotland, this year we have been very scarce in all kinds of meat, and of course the demand has not been so great on that account.

1745. Are not the farmers of Scotland at the present time getting into the practice of feeding off their cows without taking the calves from them?—In a general way they do so.

1746 And therefore if that system is continued for any length of time, they will require to increase their stock from other countries, will they not?—Decidedly, in regard to milch cows.

1747. And that is the reason why cows are imported from Denmark?—The trade developed itself; they began to come in small numbers, and they seemed to take well, and then they were shipped in large numbers. The price regulates the supply entirely.

1748. Have you ever heard of any of those cows that come from Denmark being affected either by pleuro-pneumonia or by cattle plague?—Never.

1749. I think you stated that the importation of dead meat, such as it is, from America, could not be extended to the continent?—I do not think it could.

1750. For what reason?—In the first place I do not think that they could supply this country with slaughtered beasts in sufficient quantities or in such condition as to take the place of the live stock.

1751. But might not the means adopted for the importation of dead meat from America be extended and made use of for the importation of dead meat from the continent?—It may be so, but I understand that there is a great difficulty in regard to ice in many parts of the continent; of course I know perfectly well that there is a general feeling among the farmers in our country that the slaughter of foreign cattle is going to release them from all their doubts and difficulties; but I cannot see from experience how this country can be supplied in carcase from the continent or from any other place.

1752. In fact, you do not see how the American plan of bringing over dead meat can be adopted by the people on the continent?—I do not.

1753. And the principal reason why you think that it cannot be adopted on the continent is on account of the scarcity of ice there?—Yes, and the risk of sending it; I have seen a calculation made in regard to the per-centage of foreign cattle which come to this country in reference to the quantity of home stock; but I have always been of opinion that they seemed to calculate it upon the average during the whole year, whereas the cattle from the continent during six months of the year from one of the greatest sources of our supply; and therefore the proportion represented during those six months is much greater than what it is if you put it over the whole year.

1754. What is your opinion of the health of stock just now in this country?—It never was healthier, I fancy, than at the present time.

Mr. *Pease.*

1755. With regard to that price of 7¾ *d.* per lb., which you mentioned as being the price of

Mr. *Pease*—continued.

of American cattle in Glasgow last week, does that apply to the whole of the carcase?—Yes.

1756. At what price was the Scotch beef selling at the same time?—That was 7¾ *d.*, and the price of Scotch beef would be a farthing more; 8 *d.*

1757. What would be the average weight of those American beasts if they came over alive?—I should think about an average of 800 lbs. when killed, or about 1,500 lbs. alive.

1758. Those cattle are sent upon consignment to you to make the best you can of, I suppose?—Yes.

1759. When you return such a price as 7¾ *d.*, is there perfect satisfaction on the part of the consigner?—We have never had any complaints about the results of any sales that we have made from America.

1760. Have you any idea at what price per lb. the American market would supply those cattle in Glasgow?—As far as I understand from the shippers the American beef cannot be sold in Glasgow profitably under 6¼ *d.* per pound.

Chairman.

1761. Is that dead?—In carcase.

Mr. *Pease.*

1762. But taking the live beast?—Taking the live beast, it is as I have shown you before.

1763. And you prefer the live beast to the dead meat, because it can be sent from market to market?—Yes, and if Newcastle has a short market or an over supply we can get cattle from there, or *vice versâ*, to regulate the market as trade requires.

1764. Do you ever hold cattle over from market day to market day?—We seldom do so. We sell out nearly every week.

1765. How many cattle market days have you in Glasgow?—One on Monday and one on Thursday.

1766. How far south do you take those American cattle from Glasgow?—I sent some to Sheffield on Monday last.

1767. What price did they produce in Sheffield?—I should think they were worth about as much in Glasgow as they were in Sheffield; but being able to move them to suit ths trade is an advantage.

1768. What would be the cost of that mode of transit?—The cost of that mode of transit is something like 15 *s.* per head.

1769. That would bring them down something like a farthing a pound, would it not?—Yes.

Mr. *Anderson.*

1770. Is the loss on the importation of live stock from America serious as regards depreciation?—No; for some months in the year we have very little damage, or hardly any perceptible loss whatever.

1771. Is that loss from the wasting of flesh, or is it from the animals getting knocked about by gales?—If there is loss at all there is a risk of loss from both causes; but I should consider that it is the loss of offal more than the loss of beef.

1772. Then in reality the depreciation of flesh is not a serious item in an ordinary voyage?—No, it is not.

1773. Do you consider all these diseases rinderpest, pleuro-pneumonia, and foot-and-mouth disease to be imported diseases?—So far as the

Mr. *Anderson*—continued.

cattle plague is concerned, I have no doubt whatever that that is imported; but I consider that pleuro-pneumonia can be generated, without either contagion or infection from abroad, in this country.

1774. And it always exists more or less in this country?—It does.

1775. Therefore any regulations to prevent importation will not necessarily prevent the existence of the disease here?—Certainly not.

1776. Then your opinion is that our regulations should apply rather to the prevention of the cattle plague being imported than to pleuro-pneumonia?—Quite so; unless the latter is prevalent in any foreign country.

1777. What do you say as to foot-and-mouth disease?—Foot-and-mouth disease is another disease which, in my opinion, is atmospherical. For example, it broke out in Ireland last year where they never allow any foreign cattle to go; and we have no security that foot-and-mouth disease may not break out at any time or at any place.

1778. Then you do not consider that an imported disease either?—I do not. I have seen foot-and-mouth disease come from abroad, but in my opinion it is not an imported disease.

1779. The outbreak in Ireland was not traced to import?—It could not be, because they did not allow cattle to be imported into Ireland; there was no importation of cattle allowed into Ireland.

Mr. *Elliot.*

1780. Have not the restrictions in Germany stimulated the production in Scotland?—Certainly, but we cannot produce anything like the quantity of cattle of a certain class that is required in this country.

1781. We have not had sufficient time to do so, have we?—No, but we export cattle from Scotland to other places.

1782. You say that you think the dead-meat trade could not succeed in hot weather; are you aware that since last June it has every month been increasing in quantity?—Yes.

1783. And that last month is a hot month in America?—Yes, I know that.

1784. How do you account for that?—I account for it in this way: that the parties who have the steamers engaged, have been at great expense in fitting up the refrigerators, and they have the space taken, and, of course, they expect things to improve and they face it up; but you may depend upon it that the trade will go down in hot weather.

1785. The fact is, that it comes?—Yes.

1786. And it is fit to eat?—It is eatable, certainly.

1787. Is it not sometimes the case that the cattle salesman and the butcher have a greater hand in regulating the price of the meat than the consumer?—I do not think so.

1788. The producer sends it, as a rule, to the auctioneer, does he not?—To a salesman, or auctioneer, or sells it himself.

1789. And then the consumer buys the meat, and the butcher very often gets the profit of the hide, and one or two other things, which are not included?—I think the public get the beef very often as cheaply as the butcher has it to give them. There is a good deal of competition in that business.

1790. If the beef could be bought in ordinary

ships,

Mr. *Swan.*

4 June 1877.

Mr. *Elliot*—continued.

ships, would not that very much interfere with the butcher's trade and the salesman's trade?—I do not think so. Independently of all the American meat that has come, we sold 6,000 more cattle last year than we ever did before.

1791. But you are not producers to a large extent, are you?—We pay nearly 3,000 *l.* a year rent. We fatten generally about 2,000 sheep and about 100 cattle every year.

Sir *Rainald Knightley.*

1792. You stated that we could not depend upon the supply of dead meat continuing; to what cause do you attribute that?—Because it is not paying in many cases.

1793. Has there been any diminution lately?—No.

1794. It has been gradually increasing, has it not?—Yes, there has been more coming.

1795. Then why should the supply continue to increase if it does not pay?—I understand that something like 230 tons came to London last Friday. My reason for thinking that it cannot continue is simply that here is an account of a lot of meat which was sold on Friday. The price ranged from 4 *s.* 3 *d.*; that is 6½ *d.* per lb. for the best to 3 *d.* per lb. for a large proportion of it. My opinion is, that that trade can never continue, because if they can get 7¾ *d.* or 8 *d.* per lb. for the beef coming alive, it is not likely that they will send it here dead for 3 *d.*, and run the risk of its being condemned altogether,

1796. Then you think that the supply in England will not continue to increase?—That is my candid opinion.

1797. Because the price of meat is going down?—The price of meat is getting higher, but this meat is not coming in marketable condition.

1798. Do you think that it will continue to come in the summer months as well as the winter months?—It may come in the winter months, but I do not think that it will come in the summer months.

Mr. *James Corry.*

1799. Do I understand you to say that the importers of the meat adopt the refrigerator principle at their own expense?—Yes, I believe so.

1800. I was under a different impression; I thought that the owners of the ships fitted up the refrigerators, and that the importers paid the freight for the carrying of the meat?—I was told to-day by one of the largest exporters from New York, the nephew of Mr. Samuels, that the exporters engage so much space at, I think, 30 *s.* a ton measurement on board the ship; that they provide the ice, and also fit up the refrigerators at their own expense.

1801. In the importation of live stock are you aware whether any special arrangement is in existence with regard to the fitting up of the ship?—The shipper of live stock pays for the fittings in most cases.

1802. Are you aware of that from your own personal knowledge?—I know that in the case of the last lot of sheep that we had, we had to sell the fittings when the beasts arrived.

1803. Do you import from America, yourself?—No, we sell them on commission.

1804. But you have consignments from America?—Very large consignments; we had 320 cattle last week.

Mr. *James Corry*—continued.

1805. From what part of America did those come?—From Montreal.

1806. They were from Canada then?—Yes, but we have sometimes large quantities from New York as well.

1807. Do they go direct to Glasgow?—Yes.

1808. The fittings for the live stock you say you sold?—The fittings for the live stock were sold for the benefit of the shipper of the cattle.

1809. Is that trade increasing?—It is.

1810. And likely still to increase?—We think so.

1811. You think that the import of dead meat is not likely to keep up, but that the import of live stock is likely to increase?—Yes.

1812. You think there is a difference of about 2 *d.* per lb. in favour of the live stock?—Yes.

1813. Are you aware what the freight of the live stock is?—From Montreal to Glasgow it is about 7 *l.* per head of live cattle.

1814. And from New York?—From New York I think the freight is 30 *s.* per ton measurement of 40 feet for carcases.

1815. I think you said that last year cattle which came from Ireland were in considerable numbers affected with foot-and-mouth disease?—Yes.

1816. Was there no examination of those cattle at Dublin?—Yes, I believe there was.

1817. And they were passed in Dublin?—I believe so; they came at any rate.

1818. Were they inspected again at the Broomielaw in Glasgow?—Yes.

1819. And sent on to Edinburgh?—Yes, a bullock suffering from foot-and-mouth disease is sent up in the machine to the slaughter-houses, and the balance of the cargo is allowed to go anywhere they like, either to feed or slaughter.

Mr. *Torr.*

1820. Alluding to that foot-and-mouth disease in Ireland, do you say that it was a spontaneous outbreak?—I think so; it was limited to the Irish cattle.

1821. Do you know at all how it originated?—No, but it is not difficult to conceive. A great number of the Irish cattle are very much more liable to take it than either the English or the Scotch cattle.

1822. You do not know how it originated?—It originated about Dublin, I think. The cattle shown in the Dublin market last year were almost certain to bring it to this side of the channel.

1823. You think it originates to a great extent in the Dublin market?—It did so last year, I think.

1824. You have given the Committee a good deal of information about the relative prices of dead and live stock; have you any interest yourself in importing them one way or the other?—Not otherwise than in selling them on commission.

1825. You spoke about selling them, and stated that the difference per head between cattle alive and dead was about 3 *l.* per head in favour of the cattle imported live from America?—Yes.

1826. How do you arrive at that figure?—We sell a bullock at so much, say 28 *l.* alive.

1827. You are speaking now as a cattle salesman in your own trade?—I am speaking individually as it were. I sell a bullock say at 28 *l.* alive; that we calculate at 82 *s.* per cwt.; that makes

Mr. *Torr*—continued.

makes 8¾ *d.* per lb. for the animal. We take off 1 *d.* per lb. for his offal, which leaves the bullock at 7¾ *d.* for the carcase as it hangs; then the four quarters of the carcase of the bullock are fetching this morning 5¾ *d.*; so that the difference between the value of a bullock killed in England and of one arriving dead from America in carcase amounts to 2 *d.* per lb.; that is to say putting the 5¾ *d.* for the dead meat against the 7¾ *d.* for the live animal slaughtered here.

1828. Do you consider that 5¾ *d.* was not an exceptionally low price?—No, there were some sold the week before at 3 *d.*

1829. But that was probably not in sound condition?—American meat will decay, but it rarely stinks; 3 *d.* a pound for the meat which I saw sold was a fair market price according to its condition and risk to the buyer.

1830. But it was not in good condition?—I want to show you that you have no certainty of its coming in good condition.

1831. Are you aware that beef is selling to-day at 9 *d.* to 10 *d.* per pound?—I saw some very good hind quarters sold on Saturday at 4½ *d.*

1832. But that is not an answer to my question; are you aware that the selling price to-day of beef in the Liverpool and other markets is 9 *d.* and 10 *d.*?—Do you refer to the retail price.

1833. I mean in many of the establishments where they sell nothing but imported meat; I ask you whether you are not aware that the average price of this now is from 8 *d.* to 10 *d.* a pound, according to the quality?—No. Not ex ship.

1834. No, as they come?—I never heard of hind quarters being worth 8 *d.* or 10 *d.* a pound, but I should suppose that the butcher would require to get that for it at the retail price to pay him.

1835. That is the fact which has been stated before this Committee?—I know what you mean, but I never heard of an American beef salesman, as I may call him, making 9 *d.* or 10 *d.* per pound for hind quarters of beef.

1836. From the manner in which you gave your evidence with regard to the relative value of live-stock and dead-stock imports, you really made out a difference of nearly 50 per cent.; that is to say, the difference between 5¾ *d.* for dead meat and 7¾ *d.* for cattle imported alive; if the Committee were to take that as evidence of the general import, do you think they could rely upon that as the average, not only in Glasgow, but at Liverpool and other importing places?—I should consider that the American live cattle sold in London to-day, as compared with the last cargoes of American dead meat, would realise more than that difference which I have given you, taking the sales on Friday last, for example, in the dead meat market.

1837. You have told the Committee that your business is that of a salesman of live cattle and sheep?—It is.

1838. And therefore your experience, I presume, would be more to be relied upon as a salesman of live cattle than in respect to dead meat?—I have been at nearly every sale of American dead meat which has taken place at Glasgow yet, and therefore I know pretty much about it.

1839. Have you ever gone into the calculation yourself as to the relative cost of the dead carcase and the live one coming to this market?—I have.

Mr. *Torr*—continued.

1840. Can you tell us what the relative cost is?—The cost of a carcase of beef coming from America, including the selling, is something like 5 guineas, according to my information.

1841. What does that include?—That includes ice, space, commission, and the expense of bringing the meat to market on this side.

1842. From the time that it is put on board in America to the time that it is sold here?—Yes, from the time it is put on board in America until its sale in this country.

1843. That, of course, includes freight?—Yes.

1844. What is the expense connected with a live animal from the same port?—From the same port I should think the cost is about 8 *l.* 15 *s.* We generally calculate it at that figure.

1845. £.8. 15 *s.* for the live animal as against 5 *l.* 5 *s.* for the dead animal?—Yes.

1846. You stated that you thought that the supply of dead meat could not be carried on at that rate; that it would not continue?—I said so.

1847. You simply base that upon the relative profits of the dead and live cattle?—I derive my opinion from this fact, that it cannot be a safe business when it is worth, we will suppose, 6½ *d.* to-day, and 2½ *d.*, to-morrow, per lb; the meat of itself is a first-class beef, and were it presented in same condition as home killed meat of same quality, 6½ *d.* per lb. is under value for it.

1848. The import of meat is as much a commercial operation as the import of cotton, and, therefore, it will be determined by its ultimate issue, whether it is profitable or not?—Yes, it will come if it pays, and it will stop if it does not pay.

1849. You do not think that the import of meat will be a profitable trade?—I do not think it will continue as it is coming just now.

1850. There is one other question which I wish to ask you; you say the consumption of beef in this country is increasing faster than we can produce it, in the way of breeding?—Yes.

1851. Do not you think that if we could find means to stop the increase of this cattle plague, it would greatly increase the supply of our own stock; that is to say, that the existence of the cattle plague is a discouragement to breeding?—Decidedly it is.

1852. Then if we could stamp out or stop the import of cattle plague, would not that materially tend to increase the supply of beef in this country, by encouraging breeding?—I think that anything which can keep out the cattle plague from this country, is perfectly right to be adopted. Breeding is not gone into in Scotland, nearly so much as it used to be. I do not know whether that is to be attributed to the risk of disease or not, but that is the fact.

Chairman.

1853. I understood you to say just now, that five guineas represented the expense connected with the dead carcase?—Yes.

1854. And 8 *l.* 15 *s.* represented the expense connected with the live beast?—Yes.

1855. Does that amount include freight?—In both cases.

1856. In your previous evidence, you stated, I think, that from Montreal to Glasgow, the freight was 7 *l.* 10 *s.*?—£. 7, I think.

1857. And the whole expenses connected with the live beast, amounted to 8 *l.* 15 *s.*?—Yes.

Mr. *Swan.*

4 June 1877.

Mr. *Arthur Peel.*

1858. What was the cost of the beast at starting?—We have no information upon that point; they do not tell us.

Chairman.

1859. You stated that you did not think the import of dead meat could continue as it is coming just now?—Quite so.

1860. Where was your experience gained; in London?—In London, Edinburgh, Glasgow, and everywhere else where I have seen it sold.

1861. And yet the import has increased steadily?—Yes, it has.

1862. Are you aware that the import in the last three months shows a very large increase?—Yes; but I spoke to one of the principal importers who ships from America (they call him Toffey, I think), and he told me that the price of beef that day was a ruinous business, and that it took 6 ¼*d.* to pay the sender.

1863. Is the meat which is sold in the various markets kept in the chamber in which it is brought over, or is it taken out at Glasgow where it is landed, and sent on by rail to Edinburgh, or wherever else it may be sold, before it is sold?—It is taken out of the chamber and sent on by rail.

1864. Do you conceive that, supposing the trade grew, and the conveyance of that meat could be ensured in the same atmosphere in which it made its voyage, to the market where it is to be sold, that state of things would continue?—I think so. Directly it is exposed to the atmosphere for 24 hours, it does not matter whether it is warm weather or cold, it begins to sweat, as they term it; it looses bloom, and gets very quickly out of condition.

1865. But you would be able to sell it during that 24 hours, just in the same way as you are now obliged to sell meat in hot weather which you must get rid of during that time?—Quite so; it would require to be consumed during the 24 hours.

1866. But could not you retain it in the chamber in which it arrives, where it may continue sound for any given length of time, until the time when it was required for sale in the market?—Yes. Messrs. Bell, when they get a cargo of meat, take as much out of the chamber as they require for the Glasgow market; then they leave the balance of the meat in this chamber until they require it again for sale, which may not be for two or three days.

1867. Does not that point to the fact that the loss which you describe in the way of depreciation is a question of the mismanagement of it,

Chairman—continued.

and that if it could be treated as Mr. Bell treats it, namely, by allowing it to remain in the cold chamber until you had a sale for it, you would be able to use the dead meat as well in every instance as during 24 hours after it arrived at the port?—No, I cannot see that this trade can go on at all in this way, especially with steamers from the Continent, which require to make repeated passages.

1868. Do you admit that there is a sale for this meat if it is brought out within 24 hours after it arrives?—Certainly; it can always be sold at some price.

1869. And you admit also, do you not, that if it can be kept in that same atmosphere it will continue for almost any length of time to remain sound?—Yes, I suppose it would; but I cannot speak upon that point.

1870. Then supposing you can arrive at the point of retaining the meat in the chamber until you have a sale for it, would you not derive the same benefit from that meat then as you admit you do now in the first 24 hours?—I think the meat could be kept very likely twice as long again as it is after coming from America, if retained in the same atmosphere, but after it is exposed to the ordinary atmosphere it very soon begins to fall off.

1871. Does it not result in what I have just asked you, namely, in a question of management only, and that you should keep the meat until you have a sale for it in the atmospheric condition in which it is likely to remain sound. You complain that the meat after a certain period of exposure becomes unfit for sale, but you admit that the meat is fit for sale for 24 hours after it is taken out of the chamber in which it arrives?—Yes, that is so.

1872. Could not you create a state of things in the train by which you could carry the meat almost in the same atmospheric condition until you have a sale for it?—But you would require to create that condition in the shops as well.

1873. The shops have to deal with meat in hot weather in the ordinary case?—Quite so; but meat is better for keeping when slaughtered on the spot than when brought from a distance.

1874. You are aware that the shopkeepers complain now that they can only kill meat in the summer-time for the day's consumption; that is rather against what you have just been stating?—No, the home meat would keep better than the meat imported would.

1875. And yet the dead meat will keep for 24 hours after it is exposed to the atmospheric influence?—Quite so.

Wednesday, 6th June 1877.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Anderson.
Mr. Assheton.
Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. Chaplin.
Mr. James Corry.
Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.
Mr. Elliot.
Mr. W. E. Forster.
Mr. French.
Mr. John Holms.
Colonel Kingscote.
Mr. M'Lagan.
Mr. Murphy.
Sir Rainald Knightley.
Mr. Norwood.
Mr. Pease.
Mr. Arthur Peel.
Sir Henry Selwin Ibbetson.
Mr. Torr.

SIR HENRY SELWIN IBBETSON, BART., IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. MARK WHITWILL, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

1876. I BELIEVE you are the Managing Owner of some steamers trading between Bristol and New York?—I am.

1877. Have you had any dealing with the new trade which has been created for sending over dead meat to this country from America?—In each of the steamers I have let off a portion of the space for the purpose of having one of the meat-rooms fitted up.

1878. Is that letting a letting to the patentees of a company possessing these refrigerators, or is it a letting to some trader who supplies the meat?—The patentee hired the space, and fitted up the meat-room, and sends the meat.

1879. The consignment of the meat and the room in which it is consigned to this country, are one concern?—Yes.

1880. So that you yourself have nothing to do with it, excepting letting the space for the purpose in your steamers?—I have something to do with it, because the shipper of the meat has asked me to act as agent for him in Bristol.

1881. Then you are practically acquainted with the working of the process?—Yes; so far as one can be in a short time.

1882. Can you state how the chambers are kept at an even temperature?—Yes; there are coils of pipes on every side of the room, and a coil down the centre of the room. Those pipes are filled with intensely cold water, and that water is produced by the dissolving of ice by salt. The ice and salt are placed in a tank; the water that flows is pumped by a small pump placed there for the purpose into those pipes; and the cold water is kept in constant circulation.

1883. The object being, I suppose, to maintain an even temperature?—Yes.

1884. Can you tell the Committee what the required temperature is?—It is important that the temperature should not sink below 34 degrees, and it is desirable that it should not rise above 36 or 37 degrees; but, as a matter of fact, it does sometimes rise beyond that temperature.

1885. I suppose the principal object is to maintain it without much fluctuation?—That is of very great importance.

Chairman—continued.

1886. When did this trade first begin at Bristol?—In April of this year the first consignment arrived. On board the first boat there were 102,464 lbs. of beef.

1887. Do they consign mutton as well?—They have done so on two occasions.

1888. I suppose the meat that is sent over in the chamber is not packed close, is it?—Not very close; the meat is in quarters, and each quarter is sewn up in coarse bagging, and is suspended by a hook from the roof. It is important that the meat should not be packed too closely.

1889. So that the air may circulate freely throughout the compartment?—Yes.

1890. You stated that on the 3rd of April you had your first consignment; have you had regular consignments since that time?—On the 17th of April there was another consignment, and on the 30th another, and on the 21st of May another, and on the 28th of May another.

1891. Do you receive them now weekly?—About once a fortnight we reckon upon receiving them; but sometimes it happens, from various causes, that the steamers overlap each other a little.

1892. You stated that on the 3rd of April the cargo consisted of 102,464 lbs.; has that quantity been maintained or has it increased?—The room was filled on that occasion.

1893. Was that the total quantity brought in one steamer?—Yes.

1894. Then that is the amount that you would be able to import in one steamer?—Yes. Of course the rooms in the steamers are not precisely the same size. The five consignments consisted of 546,810 lbs. of beef, and there have been two consignments of mutton.

1895. That is the amount which you have brought in since April 3rd?—Yes.

1896. Is there any other direct import of American dead meat into Bristol?—There is no other direct import into Bristol.

1897. Speaking from your experience, though

Mr. *Whitwill.* 6 June 1877.

Mr. *Whitwill.*

6 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

it is not of very great length, have you found that the cargoes arrive in good condition under those circumstances?—Some of them arrive in excellent condition, and I believe that they all might arrive in good condition if thorough care were observed in every respect.

1898. Do you mean that in certain instances where that has not been the case it has been from the fault of the packing, or from some other reason?—I consider that on one occasion there was rather too much meat put into the chamber; the meat was rather too closely packed.

1899. It depends, I suppose, entirely upon maintaining this free circulation of air round each particular parcel?—Yes, and having the chamber properly cooled before the meat is put on board.

1900. Those are difficulties which, with experience of the trade, can be easily overcome?—I think so, quite easily.

1901. Do you believe that as the experience of that trade grows it will be one which will develop itself into a certain trade?—I think it will. I may say that, so far as I can ascertain, there is no prejudice whatever in Bristol on the part of the consumers with respect to the meat.

1902. But from your own experience, and from what you have seen of the cargoes, for which I understand you to say you are the agent, have you seen sufficient to justify you in saying that you believe it is possible to introduce this meat in a condition permanently in which you can rely upon the cargoes arriving fit for food?—I think so, certainly.

1903. With regard to the trade in this meat, after it has arrived, have you been able to dispose of these cargoes in the immediate neighbourhood of Bristol?—No, not of the whole.

1904. Have those portions of the cargoes which you have been able to dispose of in the neighbourhood of Bristol turned out satisfactorily?—Yes, I may say that those dealers who have bought the meat once have purchased it again.

1905. They have continued customers in consequence of being satisfied with the first purchase?—Yes.

1906. Will you give the Committee the price at which the meat has been put upon the market?—The highest wholesale price has been 6¼*d.* per pound. I am now speaking of the whole side; the fore and hind quarters of the animal together.

1907. Has it fluctuated much?—I think the lowest price which they have taken for a side has been about 5¾*d.* per lb.

1908. During the whole time that you have imported this meat, since April, you have found a ready sale for a portion, at all events, of the cargo in Bristol itself?—Yes.

1909. You have found no difficulty in getting rid of it, although in the same market there was meat fresh killed by the butchers?—I stated just now that we are not able to sell the whole of it; we have sent part of it away to a distance.

1910. With regard to that which you have sent away, have you sent it to any distance?—We have sent it to London.

1911. Has it been sent to London under the same atmospheric conditions as those under which it arrived at Bristol?—No; it has been sent in the ordinary railway van.

1912. Are you able to tell the Committee what the results of your sales in London of those portions of the cargo have been, and whether they have been received at their ultimate market in London in the same fair condition?—I have had nothing to do with the sales which have taken place in London. When the meat is sent to London the agent of the shipper in London deals with it.

1913. Can you tell the Committee what time elapses between the meat being taken out of the ship, and therefore out of the atmosphere in which it was brought over, and its being delivered on the market in London?—Yes; it leaves the ship about half-past two or three o'clock in the afternoon, and is delivered at Smithfield between four and five o'clock, I think on the following morning.

1914. I suppose it is offered for sale in the early morning of the next day?—It is so.

1915. But 14 or 15 hours have elapsed since it was taken out of the cold air in which it was brought over?—That is so.

1916. You stated that you had not yourself had any complaints of the meat that you have so sent forward?—Some of the meat has not turned out so satisfactorily as one could have wished. As I stated, in one case the meat was too closely packed.

1917. That, I understood, applied quite as much to what you sent forward as to what you sold in Bristol?—Yes.

1918. Are you satisfied that, removing it from the cold atmosphere, you can send it by rail for any number of hours without prejudicing it?—I think it is not affected by the 14 or 15 hours that it would take.

1919. Have you tested that which you have had under your own control in Bristol as to the time for which you could keep it before sale after it was taken out of the ship?—No; because I allow it to remain in the meat-house until it is sold. We do not take it out and let it remain outside; we sometimes keep it on board five or six days, keeping the room at the proper temperature.

1920. If you keep the room at the proper temperature, you believe that you may keep the meat for an indefinite time in that room, and that it will come out in the same condition for sale as it does on its arrival after the voyage?—Certainly. I would qualify that by saying that, opening the door two or three times a day, and consequently letting in warm air, does somewhat affect the meat; but if the room were hermetically sealed, I believe the meat would keep for an indefinite time.

1921. Under those circumstances, supposing that the trade develops, and that it is possible to send the meat over in this cold chamber in such a condition that it can be taken out of the steamer, and sent to any point where it may be sold, you believe that it would arrive there in such a condition as to meet with a ready market?—Most certainly.

1922. And you have found that to be the general result, with the exception, as I understand you, of one instance, in which you attribute the deterioration of the meat to the bad way in which it was originally packed?—Yes, but the meat has varied in condition. No two consignments have ever been precisely alike in quality. For instance, one consignment was unexceptionable; there was not a quarter in the whole

Chairman—continued.

whole consignment that was in the least degree injured.

1923. Was that the first consignment?—That was the first.

1924. Have you found a falling-off, then, in the quality?—The second boat was the one in which, I think, they tried to put too much meat; it was too closely packed, and I attribute the damage entirely to that cause. In the next boat the ice ran rather short before the boat arrived; they did not put enough ice on board, and the same remark applies to the fourth consignment. There was scarcely enough ice put on board; it ran short before the ship arrived.

1925. All those faults seem to be faults which are really to be overcome?—Yes; I believe every one of the faults may be most easily overcome by proper care.

1926. And if the same conditions were carried out, you believe that this meat may be sent all over the country in a condition which would render it fit to compete with fresh-killed meat in the London market?—I do. I see no reason why every consignment should not be equal in quality to the first consignment which we received.

1927. Has the price been maintained throughout at about the same amount?—Yes; the meat that arrives in thoroughly good quality can be sold at from 6 *d.* to 6¼ *d.* per pound, depending of course upon the quantity that happens to arrive in Liverpool or Glasgow at the same time.

1928. Do you know what the prices have been which those portions of cargoes have fetched that have been sent up to London?—I do not know what prices they have fetched.

1929. I suppose that the price must be maintained at something like that which you have quoted, in order to make it pay?—I am told that it must.

1930. Are you aware what the original cost price in America is before it is sent?—I can only speak from hearsay as to that.

1931. I think that is all the experience that you have had with regard to this particular branch of trade?—That is all the experience I have had.

1932. Is there any other point which you would wish to put before the Committee?—I think not. I might say that the shipper of the meat is at present in London, and I think he might give you very valuable information if you choose to summon him.

Mr. *Assheton.*

1933. Can you tell me what is paid for this chamber on board the ship?—Thirty shillings per ton of 40 cubic feet.

1934. Do you know what is the freight per carcase?—I think the freight would work out to something like 1 *d.* a pound, reckoning roughly the quantity of meat that they put into the chamber, and the amount of freight that they pay me for bringing it. They do not pay me by the pound, but by the space which they occupy.

1935. Do you think that 1 *d.* a pound would include the whole cost that a person buying a carcase in America and shipping it to Bristol would have to pay?—No; he has to provide the meat-room with ice, and the engineer to look after the engine and the meat-room. The engineer must be in constant attendance, because the

Mr. *Assheton*—continued.

chamber must be looked at every two hours at least, to watch the rise and fall of the thermometer.

1936. Do you know at all what the other two charges for the ice and the engineer will come to?—I cannot tell you at all, but ice is not an expensive item in America; it is a very few shillings a ton.

1937. Is the American ice colder than ice elsewhere?—I do not know.

Chairman.

1938. Is it not frozen at a less temperature than other ice, and therefore does it not remain in the form of ice for a longer period?—I cannot answer that question; it comes in very large blocks.

Mr. *Assheton.*

1939. Can you give me any information as to the cost of bringing a live bullock from America to Bristol?—I have not brought any live bullocks from America, but I have occasionally taken some prize cattle out, and I have charged from 15 *l.* to 20 *l.*, according to the size of the animal.

1940. Those were cattle, I presume, for breeding purposes?—Yes.

1941. And they were cattle, therefore, of quite a fancy price?—Yes. I suppose it probably would not answer to pay that freight for inferior animals; but, on the other hand, it would not pay me to carry them for less.

1942. Then do I correctly understand you that you have had no experience, and can give me no information, as to the price of bringing over live cattle, such as they kill now, to send in the form of dead meat?—No, because I have had no occasion to go into the matter. Bristol being a prohibited port, we are not allowed to import live cattle into it, otherwise I should have calculated how much I could afford to bring animals for.

1943. Have you noticed any difference in colour between the meat that has been brought from America and the meat that has been killed in England?—In that which has arrived in thoroughly good condition there is no difference at all in the colour.

1944. Do you think, then, that if there is some difference in colour, it is owing to some partial failure of the process?—I do.

Mr. *Elliot.*

1945. May not the 1 *d.* per pound which you say is charged be increased if the ordinary freights are very much higher?—The freight that is charged of 30 *s.* per ton of 40 cubic feet is a good average rate of freight; it is decidedly above the present rates of other cargoes.

1946. Therefore you think it is possible to have this meat carried even cheaper than at 1 *d.* per pound?—I do not know that the shipowner would care to have the space in a ship permanently occupied for much less, because he would take his chance of freight. I believe that about 27 *s.* 6 *d.* a ton is being paid on board some steamers.

1947. Can they raise and reduce the temperature of the cells at pleasure?—Yes; the engineer can do so by putting an extra quantity of ice, or a smaller quantity of ice, as the case may be.

Mr. *Whitwill*, 6 June 1877.

Mr. *Elliot*—continued.

1948. Can you do it quickly?—Yes, I am told that it does not take long. If he finds the temperature rising, he puts another lump of ice and a little more salt into his tank.

1949. You could bring a whole cargo, could you not, if necessary, if the ship was properly fitted up as a meat-ship alone?—No, you could not, because the vessel would not be in seaworthy trim with an entire cargo of meat; she would not be down deep enough in the water.

1950. You might bring a larger quantity, might you not?—You might bring a larger quantity, certainly.

1951. If railway vans were properly constructed, I suppose they might carry meat to all parts of England on the same principle?—Yes, I should think so.

1952. Has there been much loss sustained by the persons sending the meat in consequence of the damaged cargoes?—I cannot tell you what loss they have sustained: if you send for the gentleman I have suggested, he may be able to tell you.

Mr. *Norwood.*

1953. Your experience is confined to this spring, is it not?—It is, entirely.

1954. And you have had five shipments?—Yes.

1955. And out of the five three were indifferent in quality?—I scarcely like to commit myself to such a statement as that; they were not so good as the first.

1956. Three of the deliveries were not quite in prime condition, were they?—They were not so good as the first shipment, decidedly.

1957. Do you anticipate that you will be able to continue this trade when you get to the month of July, for instance?—Yes, I think so, because the same shipper of the meat sent meat last August into either Liverpool or the Clyde in prime condition in the very hottest weather, so he told me.

1958. I believe the rule is that the shipowner is paid whether the chamber is occupied or not?—Yes, they pay for the space.

1959. How large are the chambers that you have erected?—They measure about 250 cubic tons.

1960. So that you run no risk?—No, we run no risk at all.

Mr. *John Holms.*

1961. You say, I think, that this only forms a part of your cargo?—Quite so.

1962. And that would be generally the plan upon which this trade would be likely to be carried on?—I think so.

1963. What proportion of the cargo would be dead meat?—About one-tenth part of the space of the ship would be so occupied.

1964. How long does it usually take you to discharge the other cargo, apart from the meat?—About five days.

1965. You spoke of a chamber carrying 250 cubic tons; is that one chamber?—One chamber.

1966. You spoke of the difficulty of keeping the meat in good condition, unless the chamber was hermetically sealed; that is to say, that the opening of the door from time to time might tend to cause the meat to become unwholesome?—Every time the door is opened it does a little mischief.

Mr. *John Holms*—continued.

1967. Would it be possible to divide this one chamber into many chambers; that is to say, would you be able to open one chamber at a time, and so supply the public during those few days that you were discharging your cargo?—It would be possible, certainly. I think it would add to the safety, decidedly, but it would, of course, add to the cost of fitting up.

1968. Things of that kind are only to be arrived at by experience?—Yes.

1969. You have only tried it for a couple of months?—That is all.

1970. Is it the case that the meat put on board those boats is cooled before being put on board, and that therefore it is in a better state on arriving here for standing the climate, even if the weather is hot, than fresh meat killed here?—I am not aware that it is.

1971. As regards the quantity, you say you believe there will be sufficient quantity to maintain a trade; could you give the Committee any idea of the quantity of meat which is likely to be provided by America?—I believe there is scarcely any limit to the quantity America could supply, the question is, I expect, one of price.

1972. Have you any idea of what quantity is likely to come in?—We have had about 500,000 lbs. of it in two months; that would be something like 3,000,000 lbs. a year in Bristol.

1973. But do you know anything about the supply on the other side?—No; I suppose that it is unlimited. I can imagine the price going up so much on the other side as to interfere very much with the trade.

1974. A good deal is said about the loss that arises from the importation of dead meat through the poor not getting the offal; have you any idea what the proportion of offal would be, say, of an ox of 700 lbs. weight?—No, not the slightest; I know nothing about that.

Mr. *Anderson.*

1975. When you said that $5\frac{3}{4}d.$ per lb. was the lowest price at which you had sold the meat wholesale, do you mean that that was the price at which you sold what arrived in bad order?—To be very candid, that which arrived in not very good order was sent up to London, and was not sold in Bristol at all.

1976. Does the $5\frac{3}{4}d.$ represent the lowest price that was paid for any of the meat?—No; I expect that what is not in very good condition fetches a lower price.

1977. I think you said that you understood that unless from $6\frac{1}{4}d.$ to $5\frac{3}{4}d.$ per lb. could be averaged, the trade would not pay?—I am told that it would not.

1978. Then if a cargo came in bad order, and had to be sent to London, and sold for a much lower price every now and again, it would materially interfere with the profit, would it not?—There might be a very heavy loss, certainly.

1979. Have you heard of any such heavy losses being sustained other than the one that you spoke of where you sent the meat to London?—I have heard it stated (of course I do not know it of my own experience) that considerable losses have been sustained.

1980. You do not know at all what the price was at which the meat in bad order was sold?—No, I do not know; I cannot say that I have not heard

Mr. *Anderson*—continued.

heard it as a matter of gossip, but it did not come before me officially.

1981. There is reason to suppose, is there not, that if the selling price of all that was sold at Bristol, and all that was sold in London, was averaged, it would not be an average of 6¼ *d.* to 5¾ *d.* per lb.?—I should think it would be something considerably less.

1982. And in that case you suppose that it cannot have paid?—Probably not.

1983. I think you said that you would give the Chairman the name of the shipper, and perhaps we can get that information more fully from him?—Yes, I will do so.

Mr. *Arthur Peel.*

1984. Have you ever noticed any very serious fluctuation in the price of the dead meat from day to day?—I have noticed quotations of considerable fluctuations in the market, but I think only from about 5¾ *d.* to 6 *d.*

1985. You have never noticed anything like what the preceding witness stated of the price being 7 *d.* to-day and 3 *d.* to-morrow?—No; I do not think that the whole facts were put before you then, because the meat which was sold at 3 *d.* must have been some that arrived in very inferior condition indeed; the meat of good quality does not fluctuate in price so very much. Of course on some days a large importation may arrive into Liverpool, and the meat may fall perhaps a halfpenny a pound.

1986. Did I correctly understand you to say, that for 14 or 15 hours after the meat was taken out of the chamber it remained good?—Yes; so far as I understand, it does not suffer at all in that time.

1987. How is that consistent with the fact that every opening of the door in the refrigerating chamber, deteriorates the meat?—Because the admission of the warm air into the chamber alters the whole condition of the room, and moisture is precipitated on to the joints, and it makes a softness.

1988. But when the meat is taken out of the refrigerating room, and exposed in a railway van for 15 hours, does it not deteriorate?—The conditions are very different. You let warm air into a very cold room and shut it up again, and then you open it again and let more warm air in, and as soon as the room is shut the freezing process goes on again; and I think that does the meat more injury than staying for a few hours out of doors.

1989. Have you noticed whether the meat, when it goes bad, has the property described by a previous witness, that it decays without a smell?—I have not heard it.

1990. If the meat sent from Bristol to London started from Bristol in a bad condition, I suppose it would arrive in London in a very unpleasant condition?—I should scarcely call it bad condition; it was bad as compared with the best; it was not prime.

1991. It would arrive in London in a very bad condition, I suppose, in such a case?—No, I think not.

Mr. *Chaplin.*

1992. Out of the five cargoes that you imported, I understood you to say that three were indifferent as compared with the first two; was it with regard to the natural quality of the meat, or the condition in which it arrived?—I should think it was not the quality; I have no reason to suppose that the quality was not the same.

Mr. *Chaplin*—continued.

1993. Have you had any experience of the trade during the very hot weather?—No.

1994. Do you anticipate any difficulty in continuing it successfully?—No, because I do not think that the heat of the weather affects the meat at all whilst it is in the chamber.

Mr. *W. E. Forster.*

1995. Were those three ships that brought cargoes of rather worse quality, the last that arrived?—Four out of the five have not been so good as the first, but still it was only here and there that you would meet with a joint that was not so good as the others; it was not that the whole of the meat throughout the whole consignment was indifferent.

1996. The average price at which those consignments have sold in the Bristol market has been 6¼ *d.*, I undsrstand?—Sixpence farthing, 6 *d.*, and occasionally 5¾ *d.*

1997. When the American meat was selling at 6¼ *d.* per lb., what was the price of English grown meat?—I do not know what the wholesale price of English meat was at the time.

1998. Do you know from what part of America the cattle come that are exported?—I think from Kansas, but I am not quite certain.

1999. Then they have a long railway journey before they get to New York?—Certainly.

2000. Do they arrive alive at New York?—They arrive at New York alive, and they are kept at New York, I am told, a day or day and a half before they are slaughtered.

2001. Do you know what is the length of the railway journey?—I do not.

2002. Do you know whether they are driven any considerable distance to the railway station?—I do not; I believe they are slaughtered just outside New York, in New Jersey, at the public abattoir.

2003. You say that you think they will be able to bring this meat in hot weather as well as in cold?—The experience of last summer proves that it could be done.

2004. Is it more expense to the shippers to preserve the meat in hot weather than in cold; have they to use much more ice?—No, I should think not; because when the temperature is once reduced the chamber is closed, and it is not opened again until the vessel arrives. The engineer ascertains the temperature by a thermometer let into the door, but the door is never opened.

2005. You say that the trade has been somewhat checked by the rise of price in America; is that rise in price supposed to be owing to the demand here or to the greater demand in America itself?—I believe it is supposed to be owing to the demand here.

2006. But notwithstanding this, so far as you are concerned, the trade is still going on?—The trade is still going on, so far as I am concerned.

2007. Your ships now arriving will have the same quantity?—I know nothing to the contrary. There is one in New York now loading, and I believe she will have meat on board.

2008. Do you know at all what the profit to the shipper was when the meat was selling here at 6¼ *d.*?—I do not know at all; but I should think that it was a very moderate profit.

2009. And you do not know what is the item that they would put aside as probable loss from damaged condition?—No, I do not.

Mr. *Whitwill.*

6 June 1877.

Mr. JOHN WILLIAM MAY, called in; and Examined.

Mr. *May.*

6 June 1877.

Chairman.

2010. YOU are the Consul General for the Netherlands, I believe?—I am.

2011. And as such you are able to tell this Committee the regulations and laws governing the cattle trade in Holland?—I am.

2012. Will you tell the Committee, shortly, what laws exist with regard to the cattle plague?—The principal foundation of our legislation in this matter is the law of the 20th of July 1870, which may be considered to correspond to the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act of this country, in so far that it lays down principles upon which all the decrees affecting cattle, when diseases are prevalent, are founded. The law of the 20th of July 1870 contains a good many provisions.

2013. Does it govern the whole of the veterinary history of the country?—Yes; it governs the supervision of cattle, and the veterinary police of the country.

2014. Under that law, as I understand you, certain decrees have been issued at various times treating those diseases?—That is so. I may, perhaps, take them in their order of date. The first one, having reference to this matter, contains regulations respecting the burying, burning, and otherwise destroying the cattle which have been slaughtered, according to the law of the 20th of July 1870, or which have died of a contagious disease, and of other objects; and the disinfection of stables and other buildings, and of manure pits.

2015. Does that decree define what contagious diseases it applies to?—The decree defining the diseases to be considered contagious under our law is that of the 30th of October 1872, which states what cattle diseases are to be considered contagious, and indicates which of the measures mentioned in the law of the 20th of July 1870 are to be applied, on the breaking out or threatening of each of such diseases. The first article of that decree contains the schedule of diseases, and it is this: "Cattle plague in ruminating animals, lung disease in horned cattle (that is, pleuro-pneumonia), malignant foot disease in sheep, glanders and scab in horses and sheep, sheep-pox, splenitis in all cattle," and lastly, a disease which, I believe, I have correctly translated by "rabies" in all cattle. I may, perhaps, read to the Committee an abstract of Articles 13 and 14 of the law of the 20th of July: "On signs of contagious diseases appearing, the owner, or person having charge of the animal or animals, to give immediate notice to the burgomaster of the commune in which the cattle are. Affected animals to be immediately separated by the owner, and to be kept separated until the burgomaster, in consultation with the district veterinary officer, shall have decided on the measures to be taken." Those measures, of course, are guided by the decrees which may be in force at the time.

2016. Then what measures are adopted when any of these diseases break out?—The measures in case of cattle plague are contained in the Decree of the 30th of October 1872: "Cattle suffering from or suspected of cattle plague shall be slaughtered, and afterwards burnt or buried. The stable or building where cattle suffering from or suspected of cattle plague have been, shall be disinfected. The manure on the farm or place shall be disinfected. Dogs may be ordered to be detained." But I may mention that more detailed instructions are contained in the Regulations of the 4th of December 1870, where the method of disinfecting and slaughtering, burning, and burying, is gone into. "Destruction of infected articles by means of burning or burying; infected hay, straw, reeds, dry manure, wooden flooring, if in bad condition, old woodwork, strongly infected clothing, and other objects not suitable for disinfection, to be burned; or, if this should be dangerous, buried. Animals dying of, or slaughtered in consequence of, cattle plague or sheep-pox, more especially, to be burned, when the locality does not allow of burial. The things to be burned are collected together, with the upper layer of the road along which they have been brought, and are placed in a pit; and after having a sufficient quantity of pitch and petroleum poured over them are set on fire. The ash, or what may remain, is buried to the depth of a metre. In burying without burning the cattle are cut open; the hide is rendered valueless by being slashed; they are then placed in a pit with pitch, petroleum, or with a layer of quicklime, at least one decimetre thick, over it; on this are placed the manure, hay and straw to be buried, and over all a layer of earth one metre thick; the place is, if necessary, surrounded by a thick fence sufficient to keep out all cattle, and is to be kept fenced in for one year."

Chairman—continued.

2017. Those being the regulations by which you deal with the disease, do you at the same time deal at all with the stoppage of import into the country, or of transit through the country?—Yes; the Decree of the 8th of December 1870 prohibits the importation and transit from foreign countries of cattle, sheep, and goats, fresh hides, fresh and salted meat, unmelted fat, manure, unmanufactured wool, unmanufactured hair, hoofs, horns, and also all the offal of the animals abovementioned. There is a dispensatory power, as it were, given to the Minister of the Interior in this way: "Whenever any special cause shall render necessary any modification of the terms of this decree, our Minister of the Interior is authorised to make such modifications, taking all necessary precautions against the transmitting of infection, and with the co-operation of our Minister of Finance." At the present moment I believe that the prohibition extends to cattle, and the only exception that is now being made is allowing the transit of sheep from abroad.

2018. When you allow the conveyance of cattle by railway, have you any regulations for disinfecting the trucks, or otherwise guarding against the spread of the disease?—The Royal Decree of the 19th of October 1871 refers to that matter; it is this:—"The transport of cattle by railway may be effected only by means of trucks used exclusively for that purpose. Cattle trucks entering from foreign countries must be cleansed and disinfected at the frontier station, under the care of the railway company concerned, with observance of paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Instructions appended to our Decree of the 4th December 1870." That is paragraphs 2 and

Chairman—continued.

and 3 of the general instructions from which I have already quoted. "Disinfecting infected articles. The disinfection of infected articles is effected by first scraping them, and then scrubbing them with boiling water, to be followed by the process mentioned in paragraph 3. Destruction of contagious matter. The destruction of contagious matter is effected by exposing the infected articles to a current of air, or to a high temperature, or by the application of disinfectants. The district inspector decides which of these means shall be employed. The most usual disinfectants employed are chlorine, or chloride of lime, sulphuric acid, or carbolic acid. Stalls and sheds to be disinfected by means of chloride of lime, with or without whitewash," and so forth.

2019. Those regulations have been laid down for the purpose of protecting your country against the introduction of cattle plague from abroad?—They have.

2020. Was there any inspection established under that law with regard to the shipment of cattle for foreign countries?—There is a decree regulating that all cattle shipped for foreign countries shall be inspected before embarkation.

2021. With regard to the last outbreak of cattle plague in Germany, has any alteration in in your law taken place in consequence of that outbreak?—No; the existing laws were found sufficient to meet the case; they were very actively put into operation. On the occasion of that outbreak the Decree of the 28th of February 1877 was passed.

2022. There was a new instruction issued under the law of 1870 in consequence of that outbreak?—Yes, there was. The Decree of the 28th of February 1877 is this: "In those districts to be indicated by our Minister of the Interior, by an announcement in the Official Gazette, it is forbidden to remove, or to cause to be removed, any live cattle, sheep, or goats, without a permit given by the burgomaster of the commune in which the cattle are. In the permit must be stated the number and species of the animals which it is proposed to remove, the route by which they are to be forwarded to their place of destination, and also the time during which the permit is to remain valid. It must not be given by the burgomaster except in the following cases: (1.) For the removal of animals to the slaughter-house. (2.) Because of the change of residence of the owner or person in charge of the cattle. (3.) For the removal of cattle by the buyer at a public sale. If the removal extends to another commune the burgomaster who issues the permit is to send a copy of it to the burgomaster of the commune whither the removal shall extend."

2023. Does that apply to all removals?—That applies to all removals in those districts indicated, as the beginning of the article states, by the Minister of the Interior.

2024. Did you deal at all with the closing of markets on the outbreak of the cattle plague in Germany?—Yes, there is also a Decree of the 3rd of October 1873 which enables the authorities to make regulations as to the removal of cattle, and as to the prohibition of markets and public sales of cattle; but this was passed more especially, as is stated at the head of it, for the checking of the spread of lung disease.

2025. Have the markets been prohibited at all during this year in consequence of the alarm that was created by the outbreak of cattle plague in Germany?—Yes, the object of the measures taken on the outbreak of cattle plague in Germany was also to prevent the importation of cattle over our frontier, as we had no cattle plague in the country. As you are aware, we have had none since 1867.

2026. And at present the import of cattle into Holland is entirely prohibited, is it not?—It is entirely prohibited. On the late outbreak in Germany very active active measures were taken on the frontier most threatened by the outbreak at Emden, which is a short distance from our frontier, the result being that no importation of disease has taken place.

2027. But, as is the case in Germany, your frontier is protected by a military force at such times?—On this occasion a large military force of cavalry and infantry was sent to the frontier, in addition to the usual officials who have charge of these matters.

2028. With regard to the pleuro-pneumonia, what steps do you take?—With regard to pleuro-pneumonia, we have two decrees. The first is the Royal Decree of the 3rd of February 1877, containing the appointing of further regulations for the checking of lung disease among cattle, and revoking a Royal Decree of the 17th of April 1874, which is translated in the annual report of the Veterinary Department; but it only repeals it for the sake of replacing it by a very similar measure, but containing rather more tringent regulations. The Decree of the 3rd of February 1877 is as follows: "As soon as a head of cattle is attacked with lung disease, the owner, keeper, or shepherd shall cause all the cattle which may in consequence thereof become suspected, to be inoculated by a duly qualified veterinary surgeon, if the burgomaster so orders it. Before giving the order, the burgomaster must take the advice of the district veterinary surgeon." Then it defines the cost of the inoculation, which is to be paid by the State, and prescribes what is to be done if no proper virus can be obtained at the time. Then Article 2 says: "When a head of cattle, suspected of lung disease, cannot, while in the pasture, be entirely isolated, to the satisfaction of the district veterinary surgeon, the burgomaster, acting under his advice, shall order its removal to a stable or other building, with the observance of precautions to be instituted by the burgomaster, with the advice of the district veterinary surgeon, and it shall remain isolated until the expiration of the term mentioned in Article 5 of the Royal Decree of the 30th October 1872," which is, I believe, three months.

2029. Then you allow pleuro-pneumonia to be treated by inoculation?—Yes; but I wish to mention that, according to the Decree of the 30th of October 1872, the Minister of the Interior has the power of suspending the slaughtering in particular districts for a certain time and (this is the important point), can order the slaughtering of suspected animals. That is under the regulations to be applied to lung disease. In the province of Friesland, where, until lately, the lung disease was very rife, the slaughtering of suspected animals has been carried out since the 1st of January of this year. The result seems to have been (at all events, the result has been arrived at somehow) that we seem practically to have got rid of lung disease in Friesland.

2030. I understood

Mr. *May.*

6 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

2030. I understood you to say that pleuro-pneumonia up to the time when you attempted these measures, existed to a great extent throughout your country, notwithstanding the prohibition of the import of cattle?—We have had lung disease since the prohibition of the import of cattle.

2031. And there has been a considerable amount of it throughout the country, and since January the authorities have attempted to put it down in Friesland?—The authorities have attempted to put it down by the application of measures all over the country, but those measures have not been exactly alike. As I have already stated, in Friesland we have applied the measure with regard to the slaughtering of suspected animals.

2032. Up to this time you have treated pleuro-pneumonia generally throughout the country, by inoculation, but, subsequently to a certain date, the Minister has exercised the powers entrusted to him by the Decree of the 30th of October 1872, and has ordered the slaughter of animals suspected of pleuro-pneumonia in the district of Friesland?—And in other places; part of South Holland.

2033. What have been the results of that decree?—The result for the whole country has been, from 1871 to 1876, as follows: in 1871 there were 6,078 cases of pleuro-pneumonia in the whole country; in 1872 there were 4,009 cases; in 1873 there were 2,479 cases; in 1874 there were 2,414 cases; in 1875 there were 2,227 cases; and in 1876 there were 1,723 cases.

2034. So that you have reduced it in those five years from 6,078 cases to 1,723?—That is so.

2035. And that is to be attributed in some measure to the slaughtering of suspected animals having been adopted?—That is so. I may mention that according to my statistics on that point, in the four weeks ending the 19th of May (our returns of lung disease are made up every four weeks), 100 cases occurred in the whole country, the largest number being in the province of South Holland. The return of lung disease for four weeks, from the 22nd of April to the 19th of May of this year, is as follows:—In Guelderland, four cases; in South Holland, 87 cases; and in Friesland, nine cases; making a total of 100. The head of the veterinary department at the Hague informs me that at the present moment he considers that there are really no infected herds in Friesland; the number of cases for four weeks was reduced to nine head between the 22nd of April and the 19th of May.

2036. The measures now adopted give hope, therefore, of your being able to stamp out pleuro-pneumonia?—Certainly very strong hopes are entertained of that.

2037. You have not had, as I understand, cattle plague in your country since 1867?—We have not.

2038. Have you any law enabling you to slaughter animals which have been in contact with beasts infected with cattle plague?—According to the Decree of the 30th of October 1872, defining the methods to be adopted in dealing with the different diseases, it is stated, in Article 3, Section 1: "Cattle suffering from or suspected of cattle plague shall be slaughtered, and afterwards burned or buried."

2039. Have you any regulation, such as that which was recommended by the Committee of

Chairman—continued.

1873, that power should be given to the authorities to slaughter animals not only that were in contact with infected animals, but that were within a certain radius of an infected spot; similar, in fact, to the powers which they exercise in Germany and in Denmark?—That depends upon the meaning to be given to the word "suspected" in this section, because suspected cattle are to be slaughtered. It does not define what is suspected.

2040. You think that that would enable the authorities to take all the cattle in a given radius and slaughter them as suspected of possibly having got the infection?—I believe that would be the result of carrying out of this regulation. It also provides for the disinfecting of buildings, and so on.

2041. How is the slaughter dealt with as regards compensation; does the compensation, first with regard to cattle plague, fall upon the locality or upon the Imperial funds? First with regard to the cattle plague?—The compensation is paid from the Imperial treasury. That is to say, amounts are voted by the States General for this purpose.

2042. What proportion of the value of the animals is given as compensation?—In the case of suspected animals the full value is given, and in the case of diseased animals half the value is given. Detailed regulations are laid down for the purpose of getting at the valuation, and, in case of difference of opinion as to the value, that is provided for by the decree.

2043. Can you give the amount of compensation that has been paid?—For lung disease from the 1st of January of this year to the 15th of May we have spent as compensation for cattle slaughtered on account of having lung disease, 51,244 guilders; that is rather more than 4,200 *l.*; but we have spent 365,722 guilders, or about 30,400 *l.*, for suspected cattle; and altogether we have spent 34,747 *l.* sterling.

2044. That, I understand you to say, has been since this new attempt has been made by slaughtering to stamp out pleuro-pneumonia?—This is since the 1st of January of this year. There was slaughtering of suspected animals before that. I was speaking of the Province of Friesland.

2045. With regard to Friesland, the attempt to stamp out coincides with this large amount of compensation?—Yes.

2046. Can you give the proportion of cattle in Friesland as compared with the rest of the country?—Yes, the returns that I have are made up to the year 1875. In Friesland, there are 212,774 cattle; 120,873 sheep; 1,950 goats; 23,202 horses; and 11,525 swine.

2047. Would you compare that with the total amount in the whole country?—The total amount of cattle in the whole country is 1,456,681, of which 212,774 are in Friesland; there are 941,067 sheep, of which 120,873 are in Friesland; there are 153,082 goats in the whole country, of which 1,950 are in Friesland; and there are 338,646 swine in the whole country, of which 11,525 are in Friesland.

2048. Then the important matter is, that with that proportion of stock in Friesland, you believe that this disease has been, or is on the point of being, stamped out by the measures which have recently been adopted?—I believe that it may practically be said that it is stamped out in Friesland.

2049. Are

Chairman—continued.

2049. Are you able to speak at all as to the opinion in your country with regard to the contagious nature of the lung disease, and whether it is conveyed by mediate contagion?—The opinion entertained by the veterinarians in my country differ sometimes from that which is entertained here on this point. We think that lung disease may be propagated by mediate contagion. If I read aright the report of the Veterinary Department, that is not the opinion entertained in this country, or at all events not to the same extent.

2050. Then you look upon the disease as more infectious than it is generally supposed to be in this country?—We look upon it as being more infectious by mediate contagion.

2051. Have you considered at all the question of how your trade is affected by the establishment of the cattle market at Deptford?—Yes. In so far as what I hear from those interested in the matter goes, it appears that the cattle market at Deptford is not considered so good a market for the seller as the cattle market at Islington.

2052. The objection which they have, I suppose, is that there is a more limited trade at Deptford than at Islington?—The objection which they seem to have is this: that they get so few buyers comparatively at Deptford to what they get at Islington. I am told that the number of persons attending the market at Islington on the market-day may be put down at something like 3,000 people, and that the buyers at Deptford are something like 50 in number.

2053. At the same time the risk of the introduction of pleuro-pneumonia as long as it continues to its present extent in the Netherlands, would justify the exclusion of them from the home market, would it not?—I am not prepared to say that.

2054. You admit that the disease is still so prevalent in your country as to require very great efforts on your part to stamp it out?—Yes; but then there is the inspection on the embarkation of the animals, which is a safeguard.

2055. What is the form of inspection at the ports of embarkation?—The animals are inspected by duly qualified veterinary surgeons.

2056. Are the animals detained any time for the purpose of inspection before being shipped?—I do not know that I am acquainted with the details of the carrying out of that measure.

2057. You are aware of the time that pleuro-pneumonia remains in incubation before it develops itself?—I am aware that pleuro-pneumonia is considered to be a disease of long period incubation.

2058. And therefore the inspection at the port of embarkation is not an absolute safeguard against the breaking out of the disease, is it?—No; it is not an absolute safeguard.

2059. Have you had your attention directed to the question of the dead-meat trade?—Only incidentally.

2060. I mean with regard to the feeling of the people in the Netherlands?—There seems to be an impression that it would be extremely difficult to establish a dead-meat trade with the Netherlands on account of the extra expense to which the senders of cattle would be put.

2061. Did you hear the last witness give his evidence?—I heard a good deal of what he said.

2062. He described the way in which the meat was imported from America, and of course the length of the voyage; and therefore the time required would be very much less from the Netherlands?—Yes, certainly.

2063. You think that the expense would be an obstacle to such a system being introduced?—I think it would.

2064. Is that in consequence of the prices of the animals being higher in the Netherlands than they are in America?—Partly so. There is a return lately made giving the price of meat.

2065. You think that any addition to the cost of its transit here would throw the supply into other markets?—Yes; our dealers seem to think that it would induce them to try other markets in preference to this. In fact, any restriction put upon the trade has that tendency to a certain extent.

2066. Would it tend at all to diminish the raising of stock in the Netherlands if the import of live stock from that country were entirely prohibited?—Certainly, I think so.

2067. It would alter the conditions of farming in your country?—I think it might very likely have that effect.

2068. We have heard from Professor Müller that fresh arrangements have been made with regard to telegraphic communication as between the Governments on any outbreak of disease; are there any arrangements made in your country on that head?—Certainly. An arrangement, which I was instrumental in getting carried out was, that immediately on the outbreak of cattle plague in either country, telegraphic communication should be made direct from the Veterinary Department of the Minister of the Interior in the Netherlands to the Privy Council Office in London.

2069. That is a similar arrangement to that which was established with regard to Germany?—That may be so; I do not know.

2070. But we understood from Professor Müller that since this last outbreak it was proposed to alter that arrangement, by enabling the veterinary inspector at the place where the outbreak occurred, to communicate directly with the Privy Council Office in London, instead of sending the communication round through the office of the Minister, saving by that, of course, an interval of time; that has not been contemplated in your country?—Not that I know of. Telegraphic communication even from the remotest inspector to the Hague, would be only a question of a few minutes.

2071. Would all your ministerial offices be open and at work on Sundays, for instance?—Telegraphic communication can be carried on on Sunday in the Netherlands.

2072. It is stated as the reason why the telegraphic notice of the late outbreak did not arrive in this country that it was telegraphed first of all to the Minister who had to notify it here, and that it arrived on the Sunday, and it was not opened till the Monday, and hence the delay?—I am not prepared to say how far such details would be an obstacle to the rapid communication.

2073. I suppose that you are in a position to say that any such alteration in the arrangement, in order to facilitate the intelligence, would be capable of being made?—Certainly; any such alteration would be most readily made.

2074. You would represent to the Committee that the cattle plague has not existed since 1867 in

Mr. *May*.

6 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

in the Netherlands; that the regulations which you have adopted are so strict as to justify you in believing that you will not have a recurrence of that disease there; and that, as regards pleuro-pneumonia, you are taking maasures which point to the eradication of that disease in your country?—Certainly.

2075. Have you any measure specially applying to foot-and-mouth disease?—Foot-and-mouth disease is not in our schedules; but, in the reports which I have from the Veteriniary Department of the Hague, I see that certain recommendations on the subject have been made, and appear to have been carried out.

2076. Is there any inspection at the port of embarkation with a view to detecting that disease?—Yes, there is an inspection at the port of embarkation for foot-and-mouth disease, certainly for all animals coming to this country, and there has been a good deal of correspondence upon that very subject, the Dutch inspectors thinking that the English inspectors are rather too severe, inasmuch as they seem to have taken for foot disease mere abrasures, and so on, of the foot.

2077. From the fact that you have not scheduled it as one of those contagious diseases, it would appear that you do not look upon foot-and-mouth disease with the same alarm as we do in this country?—We do not.

2078. Is there anything else which you would like to lay before the Committee?—With regard to foot-and-mouth disease, certain recommendations have been made by the burgomasters generally that animals affected with that disease should not go along the public ways, and that they should be kept away from healthy animals, which regulations have been generally carried out where foot-and-mouth disease has been rife. They are not embodied in any decree, because that cannot be done on account of the disease not being in a schedule. It is only a recommendation, but according to this report, it seems to have been fairly carried out.

2079. But in law there is nothing to prevent the spread of foot-and-mouth disease in the country?—No, it is not in our schedule of contagious diseases.

Colonel *Kingscote*.

2080. You have stated the gross sum of the compensation which you have paid for animals slaughtered for pleuro-pneumonia; can you state how much a head it is that you allow for a cow or a calf?—No; I can say that we allow the full value for suspected animals slaughtered.

2081. Is it fancy value or butcher's value?—There are regulations as to arriving at the value. Where the owner is not satisfied with the valuation he can call in other authorities to value.

2082. Is it settled by Government officials?—By judicial authority.

2083. And the owner has the right of disputing the first valuation?—Yes; the owner has the right of disputing the first valuation and of calling in other authorities.

2084. He can refer the matter?—He can have it referred, and then the true value is arrived at; and if he is still not satisfied, the amount is paid in to the proper authority.

2085. There is no established basis that it should be butcher's value only?—I do not see that stated.

2086. I think I understood you to say that

Colonel *Kingscote*—continued.

since you have given up inoculation in the country pleuro-pneumonia has decreased?—We have not given up inoculation; the regulations as to inoculation are in force for lung disease.

2087. Is inoculation carried out?—Yes; the Decree of the 3rd of February 1877 is this: "As soon as a head of cattle is attacked with lung disease, the owner, keeper, or shepherd shall cause all the cattle which may in consequence thereof become suspected to be inoculated by a duly qualified veterinary surgeon if the burgomaster so orders it." Then the burgomaster takes the advice of the veterinary authority, and the cost of inoculation is borne by the State, and a certain sum is allowed for each head of cattle inoculated. Provision is made that "If no proper virus can be obtained, in the opinion of the district veterinary surgeon, the burgomaster may give his consent to the postponement of the inoculation until such virus can be procured. The district veterinary surgeon shall supply the veterinary surgeon charged with the inoculation as early as possible with good virus."

2088. Then the authorities in your country consider that inoculation is a preventive of pleuro-pneumonia?—Yes.

2089. And they carry it out by law?—They carry it out by law. It seems to be the opinion in my country that in the case of an animal having disease by inoculation, the course of the disease is accelerated, and also that it is a protection to the animal from further contagion of the disease. Of course in all places where the slaughtering of suspected animals is carried out for lung disease, inoculation does not take place. If in any place it is decreed that the animals suspected of lung disease should be slaughtered, then there is no opportunity for inoculation, but they are all slaughtered; so that there are two systems in the country.

2090. Who has the power of putting one or either of those regulations into operation?—The Minister of the Interior.

2091. But supposing that you have a herd of cattle, and that pleuro-pneumonia breaks out in that herd, what have you to do?—I have to report it at once to the burgomaster of the district.

2092. Who decides whether your cattle shall be slaughtered or whether you shall inoculate?—If I am in a district in which it is already ordered that slaughtering of suspected animals shall take place, my animals are all slaughtered. If I am in a district in which the decree as to inoculation only is in force, then they are taken to the stable, if it is thought necessary by the veterinary authorities, and kept there and inoculated.

2093. And you have different orders for different districts?—Yes.

2094. Is your country divided into districts?—As I have already stated, in the province of Friesland, since the 1st of January this year, animals suspected of having lung disease have been slaughtered; and that is the case at the present moment also in a part of the province of South Holland where the disease is most rife.

2095. As regards foot-and-mouth disease, I think I understood you to say that you have no regulations against it?—No, it is not in our schedule.

2096. Therefore, animals at the port of embarkation, for this country or any other country, say at

Colonel *Kingscote*—continued.

at the Hague, might be walking about with foot-and-mouth disease and no notice would be taken of them?—Notice would be taken of them, because as I have said, a general regulation is made that they shall not pass along the public highways, and shall not be brought into contact with healthy animals; but this is not a law.

2097. Are there inspectors along the quays of your ports to prevent animals with foot-and-mouth disease from being exported to London or anywhere else?—Yes, they inspect all animals sent to this country before leaving the country immediately before embarkation; and animals with foot-and-mouth disease would be rejected.

2098. But this is only done to protect yourselves against the loss which would occur if a shipload came over here with foot-and-mouth disease and was condemned; you do not do it to keep your own country free of foot-and-mouth disease?—No, it was to satisfy the requirements and regulations on this side.

Mr. *Anderson*.

2099. Do I correctly understand you to mean that the opinion of your country generally is, that inoculation does not merely make the disease more mild in the first taking, but is also a subsequent preventive?—That is the idea.

2100. So that an animal that once has pleuro-pneumonia does not take it again?—That seems to be the idea.

2101. Is that an experience which is founded on a long course of years?—I cannot tell you the fact, but the idea is that it acts as a preventive.

2102. You speak of pleuro-pneumonia and lung disease as convertible terms, do you not?—Yes.

2103. And you distinctly consider that pleuro-pneumonia is an imported disease and can be stamped out by regulations?—Yes, it can be stamped out.

2104. Is it not a disease very similar to consumption in the human subject?—I am not prepared to say how similar the two diseases may be.

2105. If the two diseases are similar, and lung disease can be stamped out, one would have thought that possibly consumption could be got rid of by the same process of stamping out?—It would require more medical knowledge than I possess to give an opinion upon that point.

2106. You think that foot-and-mouth disease is less contagious than pleuro-pneumonia?—I am not prepared to say that; we consider it a less dangerous disease.

2107. It is merely that you consider that it does not do so much damage as pleuro-pneumonia?—Yes. I do not know the opinion of the Dutch veterinarians upon the comparative contagiousness, if I may so say, of the two diseases, but they seem to consider, at all events, that the foot-and-mouth disease (and I believe it is the fact) is a much less dangerous disease, inasmuch as it is less fatal.

2108. You are aware that here we consider it highly contagious?—It is highly contagious, no doubt.

Mr. *French*.

2109. I understood you to say just now, that in all movement of cattle it is necessary to obtain a permit?—According to the Royal Decree of

Mr. *French*—continued.

the 3rd of October 1873, "It is forbidden to remove horned cattle out of or into those communes or parts of communes, which may be specified by our Minister of the Interior. This announcement is to be made generally known by publication in the official gazette." That only applies to certain districts in which it is thought advisable to bring the decree into force.

2110. Then would that permit be given to cattle suffering from foot-and-mouth disease alone? I am not prepared to say that; I do not know.

2111. Are there penalties attached to the breaking of the recommendations of the burgomaster, with regard to foot-and-mouth disease?—No; so far as I know, there are not; I do not see how there can be, if it is not in the schedule of diseases.

2112. Do you know what the penalties are that are attached to neglecting to give notice of lung distemper?—Yes; the imposition of a fine.

Mr. *Norwood*.

2113. I think you gave a general opinion that the prohibition of the import of live cattle from Holland to this country would have the effect of discouraging the breeding of cattle on your side, and, of course, of decreasing the supply to this side?—I think so.

2114. Have you gone into the question in detail?—I have not.

2115. You have not closely considered the question of the conveyance of meat in those ice safes?—I have not.

Mr. *Chamberlain*.

2116. Under what circumstances do you enforce the restrictions on the movement of cattle: is it in the case of an outbreak of cattle plague, or is it in case of an outbreak of the other diseases named?—It will be competent for the Minister to order the stoppage of markets, and so on, on the outbreak of any disease, if he thinks it advisable.

Chairman.

2117. That is to say, any disease that is in the schedule?—Yes, I am speaking of diseases in the schedule.

Mr. *Chamberlain*.

2118. Do you know whether it is done in the case of either pleuro-pneumonia or foot-and-mouth disease?—Foot-and-mouth disease is not in the schedule.

2119. In the case of pleuro-pneumonia is it done?—In an outbreak of pleuro-pneumonia it would be done.

2120. In the case of a district in which the general movement of cattle was restricted, would the movement of healthy cattle be permitted?—No, the whole movement of cattle in the commune would be stopped. The Decree says, "It is forbidden to remove horned cattle out of or into those communes, or parts of communes, which may be specified by our Minister of the Interior. This announcement is to be made generally known by publication in the official gazette." In special cases the burgomaster can grant permission for such removal, after taking the opinion of the district veterinary surgeon, and on the conditions which may be considered necessary by him."

2121. I think

Mr. *May.*

6 June 1877.

Mr. *Murphy.*

2121. I think you said that experiments have been made by way of inoculation for the purpose of eradicating, or of mitigating, the evil of pleuro-penumonia; how many years is it since those experiments were first instituted?—The Royal Decree which, so far as I know, was the first which prescribed inoculation, was the Decree of the 17th of April 1874, but that has been replaced by another one.

2122. I understand that the 17th of April 1874 was the first time that the experiment was ordered to be tried?—So far as I know, it was.

2123. Are you prepared to say what the effect of that has been, generally speaking?—That is shown in the gradual decrease of the disease.

2124. The effect of it has been to diminish the disease?—Yes.

Mr. *M'Lagan.*

2125. Is not pleuro-pneumonia indigenous to Holland; has it never arisen there without importation?—I am not prepared to say.

2126. Then, supposing that you stamp it out in any particular district, you could not say that you would not have the disease again without its being imported from any other country?—I am not prepared to answer that question.

2127. Do you know anything about the history of pleuro-pneumonia in Holland?—No, only by the regulations which have been made; I have only addressed myself to the regulations which have been made upon the subject.

Mr. *Elliot.*

2128. You said that, if the importation of live animals into England from the Netherlands were prohibited, the Dutch cattle would very likely be sent to other markets; can you say whether such a quantity as we take would be likely to be sent to other markets?—France is a great market with us; we send a great many cattle to France. I have a return here for 1875; I have nothing later than that made up; from that return I find that there was an exportation to Belgium of about 58,000 head of cattle; of course all our exportation to France would appear upon our returns as exportation to Belgium, as it all goes through Belgium. I am told that a great proportion of those were milch cows, but I am not prepared to say what. Then we have an exportation to Prussia of nearly 19,000, and all that would be capable of increase if the English market were made too difficult.

2129. Do you know whether it costs more to send cattle to France and Prussia or to England?—I have not the prices of transit by railway to France, but I should presume that the transit by railway would be dearer than the transit by steamboat to England.

2130. Therefore, if you had to send dead meat instead of live animals, that would become a part of the cost if not the whole of it?—Part of it; I do not know the amount that is paid for transport by railway into France, and unless I had that I could not compare the two.

Mr. *Torr.*

2131. Do you import breeding bulls from this country into your country for the improvement of your stock?—I believe that now and then a certain number goes from this country into Holland, but I have no return of the numbers.

Mr. *W. E. Forster.*

2132. How long has Holland been put into the list of countries from which cattle have to be slaughtered at Deptford or at the port of landing?—Only lately; until the outbreak of cattle plague in Germany in January, which seemed to have alarmed the authorities in this country, our cattle were allowed to come to the Islington Market.

2133. You have been scheduled since January?—Yes, subsequently to the outbreak at Emden.

2134. Has that diminished the number of cattle imported from Holland?—I have no return of the number of cattle during this year.

2135. It has not been brought before you that it has made much difference, has it?—It has been mentioned incidentally that the number of cattle has been less since that time, but I have no statement of the figures.

2136. The import of store cattle stopped altogether, I suppose?—Yes, I presume so.

2137. Were there many store cattle imported last year?—Of that I have no return separate from the rest of the cattle.

2138. I understand you to say that, as regards pleuro-pneumonia, you consider that the measures which you are now taking will really clear Holland of the disease?—We hope to do so by the application of the measures that can now be taken according to the decrees which are at present in force.

2139. As regards foot-and-mouth disease, though you have no regulations to stop it in Holland, you do not allow any animal to be exported that appears to have foot-and-mouth disease?—They are rejected by the inspectors.

2140. You are aware, I suppose, that, although pleuro-pneumonia is a disease which is a long time in process of incubation, foot-and-mouth disease is not?—It is not a long time in process of incubation.

2141. And, therefore, animals affected with foot-and-mouth disease would very likely be discovered by the inspector?—That is our opinion, certainly.

2142. Have you ever made any attempt to stop foot-and-mouth disease by legal measures?—No, it appears not.

2143. I suppose your reason has been that you thought you could not do it without stamping it out, and that the disease was not sufficiently dangerous for the public to put up with the stamping out?—That was our idea.

2144. I understand you to say that you do not import cattle into Holland from any continental state?—We do not.

2145. And therefore there is no fear that the Russian cattle, or the Steppe cattle, could make use of a Dutch port for the purpose of getting to this country?—No, we do not allow any importation of cattle.

Chairman.

2146. Have you ever had any cases of smuggling over the frontier, as is stated to have taken place in Germany?—I have heard of no special complaints upon that head; it is impossible to say that such a thing has never taken place.

2147. Supposing that cattle plague breaks out in Germany, there is the same risk in the Netherlands as in Germany from the Russian cattle, is there not?—No, I think not.

2148. But

Chairman—continued.

2148. But you admit that the smuggling is possible?—It is possible; but I have heard of no complaints upon that point, and our idea is that our frontier is so watched that it is next to impossible.

2149. You think that the precautions which are taken are sufficiently stringent to prevent any smuggling of diseased cattle from Germany across your frontier?—Exactly so.

Mr. *W. E. Forster.*

2150. The Dutch frontier is a very much shorter one than the German frontier?—Yes, and more easily managed.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

2151. And there is this difference, is there not, that whilst the cattle plague has almost always existed on the Russian side of the German frontier, it rarely exists on the German side of the Dutch frontier?—Yes; so that, as in the case of the outbreak at Emden, we can direct all our efforts to the threatened point.

2152. Is it not the case that you absolutely prohibit the import of cattle from Germany and from the other continental states into Holland mainly in order to secure your export to England?—That was the great motive, I believe, besides protecting ourselves; we considered it necessary for our own protection.

M. G. A. Thomsen, called in; and Examined through an Interpreter.

Chairman.

2153. You belong to Schleswig-Holstein, I believe?—Yes.

2154. Are you a practical farmer and grazier in Schleswig-Holstein?—That is my occupation.

2155. Are you well acquainted with the country?—Yes, and in particular with the west coast.

2156. Can you tell the Committee what the principal industry of Schleswig-Holstein is?—In the first line we produce cattle, dairy produce, and corn.

2157. Can you state what number of cattle Schleswig-Holstein exports in the year?—From Tonning were exported 50,000, and from Schleswig-Holstein in all 70,000 head of cattle.

2158. Do the other cattle that do not come from Tonning come from Altona, or from what port do they come?—They are exported to England only from Tonning and Gluckstadt; the remainder goes to Hamburg Market.

2159. Are those cattle that are imported into this country all reared in Schleswig-Holstein?—They are not all reared there, but most of them are. A great number of them are imported from Jutland in Denmark to the north of Schleswig.

2160. Are you aware of there being any duty on the cattle on their coming from Jutland into Schleswig?—The importation of cattle from Schleswig to Jutland is prohibited, but there is a free importation from Jutland into Schleswig.

2161. There are no restrictions on the cattle coming into Schleswig, although Denmark prohibits the cattle going back into Denmark?—That is so.

2162. Has the export of cattle to London at all changed the production of cattle in Schleswig?—Decidedly.

2163. What would be the consequences to Schleswig-Holstein if the export of live cattle to England should be suddenly stopped?—I am not able to say what consequences it might have if the live cattle could not be brought from Schleswig-Holstein, but they would be very serious and injurious to our trade.

2164. I suppose it would affect one of your largest markets for their production?—Yes, decidedly. To bring dead meat here from Schleswig-Holstein, I think, is an impossibility.

2165. Has any dead meat been exported from that country?—Very little.

Chairman—continued.

2166. Can you tell us what is the price of meat in Schleswig-Holstein at the present time?—About 6 *d.* to 7 *d.* per lb.

M. *Thomsen.*

2167. That would allow a large margin for the expenses of exporting the dead meat, because the market price of England is very much higher than that?—I do not think it is at all practicable to bring dead meat from Schleswig to this country.

2168. What are the reasons why you do not think it practicable?—In the first place the exporting is done by about 2,500 different shippers. I think that it is an impossibility that this number of shippers could combine and make a profitable business of sending their small loads as dead meat to England.

2169. Do you think that it would be possible, by establishing a company, to get over that difficulty?—That might be possible, but it is not in my line to answer that question.

2170. Would it affect this trade if the cattle which are at present imported, say from an unscheduled country, had to be imported to Deptford to be slaughtered at the port of debarkation?—I think that the production would lessen.

2171. At present they are scheduled, and are obliged to be slaughtered at Deptford under the last Order, are they not?—They do not export at present; our export begins with the beginning of July, and lasts until November.

2172. This is the period in which no export takes place from Schleswig?—Yes.

2173 And it is your opinion that, if that Order continues after the time when the export trade begins, it would seriously affect that trade?—It would influence our market very seriously; and, in case the cattle have to be killed at Deptford, they will be obliged to take them to Hamburg, Lubeck, Berlin, and other German places.

2174. And, in fact, you think that it will set up a new trade in your country, and that the present trade with England will be diverted to those places?—Yes, and it would be necessary for us to introduce other means of making our farms profitable.

2175. Have you had the rinderpest in Schleswig-Holstein?—With the exception of one case, which occurred this year in the immediate neighbourhood of Hamburg, it is my opinion that the cattle plague has not been there in this century.

2176. Does that opinion of yours refer to Schleswig and Holstein combined, or to Schles-

M. *Thomsen.* 6 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

wig alone?—To Schleswig and Holstein combined.

2177. Altona is in Schleswig-Holstein, is it not?—Altona belongs to Schleswig-Holstein, but in reality it is divided from Schleswig-Holstein, being a free territory in the same way as Hamburg, and it is surrounded by a line of custom house officers.

2178. But the export trade from Schleswig-Holstein comes partly, as I understood you to say, in answer to a previous question, from Altona and Hamburg?—It goes to Altona and Hamburg, but it does not go to this country through those places.

2179. Are you aware that the last outbreak of cattle plague came from Altona to this country?—I know it from the papers.

2180. And that therefore the cattle from Schleswig coming through Altona as a port, are, as far as their transit through and their station while they are being embarked are concerned, liable to the infection that may be imported into Hamburg and Altona?—They are not shipped from Schleswig-Holstein by the graziers to England in that way. The graziers and farmers will send them to Hamburg and bring them to the market there; and if they come at all to England from Hamburg, they are sent by senders from Hamburg, and not by senders from Schleswig-Holstein.

2181. Then do the Schleswig-Holstein farmers use only the port of Tonning?—Yes, only Tonning, and Gluckstadt since last year.

2182. Both those being ports of Schleswig?—They are ports of Schleswig-Holstein.

2183. I understand you to say that you are anxious, on account of your country, to preserve freedom of trade as between Schleswig-Holstein and the markets here; that being so, if regulations were made prohibiting the import of cattle from Altona and Hamburg, would that trade be possible as through Tonning and Gluckstadt?—I do not exactly understand the question; but if they had a free market to England they would not feel the restriction.

2184. It might be possible that in consequence of Altona and Hamburg being ports from which cattle plague has come to this country, they might be closed as regards import into this country; I understand you to say that your object is to maintain the trade free, because Schleswig-Holstein has never had the cattle plague; if we prohibited Hamburg and Altona, would the trade take the direction of coming to this country through a port like Tonning, which is in Schleswig-Holstein, and is therefore free from cattle plague, though Altona is not; is it necessary that Altona should be your port of export?—The principal export is from Tonning; the quantity being 49,000 last year, and from Gluckstadt 2,000.

2185. And 20,000 came through Hamburg and Altona?—They are taken to the Hamburg market; most of them will be eaten in Germany; they go to German towns.

2186. Have you had pleuro-pneumonia in Schleswig-Holstein?—In 1874 we had one case where they had an outbreak in one farm; but by the precautions which were taken by our Government it did not spread beyond that farm.

2187. Are you in a position to state what are the internal regulations in Schleswig-Holstein

Chairman—continued.

for dealing with these diseases?—Every farmer is obliged to give notice of a case of disease to the nearest (Landrath) counsellor of administration; and then, according to the nature of the diseases, if it is pleuro-pneumonia, it is made a rule that the place is closed at once against all neighbouring places.

2188. Is there any slaughter of cattle in infected districts in case of pleuro-pneumonia?—Not in all. It is difficult to give a decided answer on this matter, as pleuro-pneumonia can be treated by the Government according to the merits of each individual case. They take the merits of the case in which the disease appears.

2189. And they have had only one instance of an outbreak of pleuro-pneumonia in the time you state?—Yes.

2190. And that was stamped out at once?—It was stamped out at once. It was on one farm, but it was more than one head of cattle that was attacked.

2191. Is compensation paid for cattle slaughtered by the Government?—I think that they get compensation up to three-fourths of the value.

2192. Have you in Schleswig-Holstein any laws restricting the import of cattle into Schleswig-Holstein to account for pleuro-pneumonia not haveing been introduced there?—No, we have no other restrictions than those generally in use in Germany.

2193. And if pleuro-pneumonia existed in Germany, there is nothing to prevent its spreading into Schleswig-Holstein?—There is no restriction on importing cattle from Germany, but the import is to such a small extent that it does not practically make much difference.

2194. Practically, the import of cattle into Schleswig-Holstein is principally from Denmark, where the protections against these diseases are very strong?—It is so.

2195. Have you had foot-and-mouth disease among your herds in Schleswig-Holstein?—We have seldom had it; we had it some years ago, about 1872 or 1873; but the Government interfered at once in such a manner, that the disease was stamped out directly.

2196. Before it was stamped out did it spread to any extent; was it in many farms?—It spread to several farms, but it is difficult to say how many,

2197. Still it was in more than one place?—It was in more than one place.

2198. And it was stamped out by the measures that were taken by the Government?—Yes, it was stamped out by those regulations.

2199. Are you aware what those measures were?—I cannot say beyond this; that the places were closed against the neighbourhood.

2200. That they were made infected places, and that no communication was allowed?—No communication was allowed.

2201. Has sheep-pox ever existed in Schleswig-Holstein?—In my neighbourhood there has been none, but I cannot answer for the rest of the country; I do not think that there has been any.

2202. Speaking generally for Schleswig-Holstein, they have been almost entirely free from these contagious diseases for many years, and have stamped them out at once where they have arisen?—Yes.

Mr. *W. E. Forster.*

2203. May I ask whether your farm is situated in Schleswig or in Holstein?—It is in Holstein, about an English mile from Tonning, on the border of Schleswig.

2204. Your own cattle you send to Tonning?—I always send the cattle only to Tonning.

2205. Do many cattle come from the Port of Husum?—Husum is the principal cattle market in Schleswig; the markets are held there about a fortnight or three weeks before the export begins from the principalities, and the meat from there is consumed to a great extent in the country; the butchers of the country come there and buy their cattle there, but it is not a place of export. All the cattle from there are sent *viâ* Tonning to London.

2206. You are aware that for several years cattle from Schleswig-Holstein have been allowed to be brought to England without being slaughtered at the port of debarkation?—Yes, I know that, because I am a shipper myself.

2207. But the declaration that the shipper had to make only applied to cattle from a port in Schleswig or Holstein, and it did not apply to Schleswig-Holstein cattle that were sent by Hamburg, did it?—It only related to cattle sent from Tonning.

2208. And therefore any danger of cattle being infected in Hamburg would not apply to your cattle that were sent to England?—No.

2209. Will you be kind enough to tell the Committee whether the chief object of your giving us the advantage of your evidence is to prevent our passing a law that no live cattle are to be exported from Schleswig-Holstein to England, or that the cattle that are exported from Schleswig-Holstein should not be obliged to be killed at Deptford or at the port of landing?—I think it impracticable to send dead meat from Schleswig-Holstein.

2210. But I understood you to say that unless you had free importation you would be obliged to stop the trade, so far as England is concerned; does that remark apply to your not being allowed to send the cattle to be slaughtered anywhere in England, or does it apply to your not being allowed to send live meat?—The question is whether we get the free trade into England. That means getting our cattle to Islington instead of to Deptford. We shall not be in a position to trade with England at all, if we have not free trade with England; which means that we can bring our cattle to the English market at Islington and not to Deptford.

2211. Am I to understand that you do not think you can send cattle to England if the cattle have to be slaughtered at Deptford?—We shall not be able to compete with other countries if we have to bring our cattle to Deptford where it has to be killed; and if other foreign countries, like Denmark, where we have to get our lean cattle from, can bring their cattle to Islington.

2212. Were you an exporter at the time that cattle had to be slaughtered at Deptford?—Yes; I have exported to Deptford, and I have felt the consequences.

2213. We should be very glad to know what you would consider to be the loss upon a beast by sending it to Deptford rather than sending it to the Islington Market?—I estimate the loss at from 1 *l.* 15 *s.* to 2 *l.* a head on cattle, and 5 *s.* on sheep.

2214. Have you read the report of the Veterinary Department of the English Privy Council Office for the last year?—I have not.

2215. I see it is stated in that report that no case of foot-and-mouth disease has been detected during the year among cattle landed from Tonning, and that there is no reason to suspect that the disease exists in the Duchies of Schleswig and Holstein; that statement confirms what you believe to be the fact?—Yes.

2216. How are the cattle shipped at Tonning?—Every Wednesday and sometimes on Thursday four or five steamers are loaded at Tonning. The ships run a distance of about 400 miles from there to London in about 30 or 40 hours, and they had very few losses in the last year, only some head. The cattle are inspected by veterinary inspectors on shipment, and a head inspector is appointed by the Government to watch the shipment. All the cattle sent from the pastures are driven by road direct to Tonning, and a certificate has to be procured from the officials of the different communes, indorsed by the English Consul, that the cattle had been grazed for four weeks in the provinces.

2217. What proportion of the cattle that are exported from Tonning come from Denmark?—About 25,000 or 30,000 bullocks are imported from Denmark for fattening purposes in Schleswig-Holstein.

Mr. *M'Lagan.*

2218. What did the farmers of Schleswig Holstein do with their stock before the recent importation of cattle into this country?—Thirty years ago, when we were not allowed to bring our cattle to England, we were masters of the market in Hamburg and Lubeck; and the production of cattle has been increased since the decree of Sir Robert Peel in 1843 (I am not certain as to the year) to the extent of about 200 per cent. Since the year 1868 the increase in the number exported from Tonning has been about 13,000 head. The farmers have been induced to lay out their land into pastures or meadows, and there is still a prospect of increasing the quantity of cattle for export.

2219. Did you sell your cattle 20 years ago, or did you make dairy produce, and export it?—The working of the farms has been changed since that time. Some of the highlands have been more cultivated, and a lot of country which would have been used in former years for the growing of corn, has been turned into meadows and pastures.

2220. And the meadows and pastures are used for rearing cattle, or for feeding cattle, or for dairy purposes?—There are different circles, but I speak principally of the circle of Eiderstedt, which is entirely used for fattening bullocks.

2221. And the rest of the country is used for rearing stock, or for dairy purposes?—Yes, the rest of the country is used for rearing and dairy purposes, and for growing corn.

2222. Then, supposing that the importation of live stock into this country from Schleswig-Holstein were prohibited, could not a Schleswig-Holstein farmer resort to dairy production as a source of profit?—He would be obliged to fall back upon dairy farming and growing corn.

2223. Would he not find that as profitable as sending fat cattle to England?—I do not think so, because the corn is brought very cheaply from foreign countries.

M. *Thomsen.*

6 June 1877.

Mr. *M'Lagan*—continued.

2224. Do you know what has been the difference in the price of dairy produce, say of butter and cheese, for the last 20 years?—I do not recollect exactly. I think about 20 years ago butter cost about 9 silbergroschen, which is not quite 1 *s.*, and now we sell it for 13 silbergroschen per pound.

2225. Therefore, although the dairy produce did not pay so well 20 or 30 years ago, it would be very much better now, with such an increase in the price of butter?—The labour and the land, and everything, is much dearer than it was in those days, and the profit is not large enough in proportion to the outlay.

2226. Then, so far as your experience goes, you find that fattening cattle pays better than dairy farming?—At present it does.

Mr. *Pease.*

2227. Are the cattle that are sent from Schleswig-Holstein here sent on consignment?—Yes.

Mr. *Pease*—continued.

2228. Can you state the prices which they are at present realising for the full carcase?—The price varies very much. It is not a time now that they ship, but the price differs between 18 *l.* and 45 *l.* sterling.

2229. For what weight?—The weight of a bullock differs between 4 cwt. and 12 cwt. I have received as much as 45 *l.* for a bullock.

2230. For what weight?—I think about 12 cwt.

2231. At what price do you think that the Schleswig-Holstein supply will cease in this country?—It would be a question what price could be realised in Germany; it would depend a great deal upon what they could dispose of in the German market.

2232. What is the lowest price that you have ever received for cattle in the English market?—Seven guineas.

2233. Would you go on at that price?—No.

Mr. Thomas Christopher Booth, Examined.

Mr. *Booth.*

Colonel *Kingscote.*

2234. I believe you farm to a large extent in Yorkshire, do you not?—I do.

2235. Both your own land and as a tenant farmer?—Yes.

2236. And you have done so from your earliest youth?—Yes.

2237. And your father before you?—Yes, and my grandfather.

2238. You are also a member of the Council of the Royal Agricultural Society, are you not?—I am.

2239. And I believe you breed largely?—I both breed and graze.

2240. You breed very high-pedigreed shorthorns, do you not?—I do.

2241. And you have a very valuable herd?—I have.

2242. You have also common dairy stock?—Yes, I breed a good many other cattle besides; I breed the ordinary Yorkshire shorthorned cattle, and also I feed off from 100 to 200 fat cattle every year.

2243. Have you experienced, during the time that you have bred stock, great losses through foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases?—From foot-and-mouth disease, especially, I have experienced very great losses.

2244. It, in fact, almost ruined your herd, did it not?—Between 1869 and 1872 my herd was reduced by the foot-and-mouth disease by more than one-half.

2245. You have had it more than once, have you not?—I had five separate attacks in my herd in less than three years.

2246. Can you tell the Committee how those attacks came on your herd; were they through your buying beasts from other markets, or from what other circumstances?—I never had an outbreak through buying cattle from a fair, but my farm is peculiarly situated; there are two public roads dividing it, and cattle are continually being driven to and fro along those roads from fairs and other places. In fact, one buyer for the London and other dairies lives on a farm close by me, and he is continually sending cattle

Colonel *Kingscote*—continued.

to and fro, which are driven from all parts of Yorkshire and the county of Durham.

2247. Will you tell us near what towns or how you are situated?—I am within two miles of Northallerton, 14 miles from Darlington, 30 miles from York. York and Darlington are the two great markets for store cattle and milch cows in the district.

2248. Owing to those cattle being driven along those roads, you have suffered to the extent you say?—Undoubtedly.

2249. And you are liable to it at any time?—Yes.

2250. Therefore I conclude that you are very well pleased that there is such a restriction upon the movement of cattle that none of those cattle can pass through your farm?—Undoubtedly.

2251. But, at the same time, those restrictions are very hard upon yourself and others who want to get your cattle to market?—They are. At the present time I cannot send my cattle, at least until within the last few days I could not send my cattle, to any part of either England or Ireland, or even abroad. The whole of the world, you may say, is shut against us at the present time.

2252. Has it been so since the outbreak of rinderpest?—Before that. Since the outbreak of 1872, Australia is closed against us, and New Zealand and America; in fact, all the world. We used to send shorthorns to the most remote parts of the earth, you may say.

2253. As I understand, since the outbreak of rinderpest, the restrictions upon the movement of cattle in Yorkshire have been such that you could not send your cattle anywhere except to market for slaughter, is that so?—Undoubtedly, it is so. There was no market whatever open in the North Riding; the whole of the markets in the North Riding were closed. The movement of cattle was quite free within the Riding itself, but no public sales were allowed. I could send my cattle to Leeds and Wakefield, the two largest fat meat markets for the West Riding, but only for slaughter.

2254. Therefore,

Colonel *Kingscote*—continued.

2254. Therefore, practically, for breeding purposes, the whole country has been shut against you and all others in Yorkshire, so far as any sale has been concerned?—Undoubtedly. When the cattle plague broke out at Hull, the justices for the North Riding immediately took steps to prevent the introduction of the disease into the North Riding, and they placed a double cordon of police round every possible outlet throughout the whole Riding, necessarily at a great expense to the ratepayers, in order to protect themselves against the introduction of cattle plague.

2255. Although it has been a great expense, I need not ask you whether you would not sooner bear your share of that expense than be subject to the rinderpest?—Undoubtedly so.

2256. But, at the same time, it enhances the price of animals to the breeder, if you wish to part with them, and to the consumer?—Undoubtedly it raises the price of meat. Meat has been dearer in our markets lately than it has been for several years.

2257. Now, as to the foreign trade; you have been accustomed for many years, I believe, to send a very large number of your high-bred stock abroad, some to America, a great many to our colonies, and some to the continent of Europe?—Yes.

2258. That exportation has been entirely stopped for some years now, has it not, except to America?—Yes. Australia has been stopped the longest. Australia was, at one time, our best customer for shorthorns. I could not say the number that have been shipped there, but a considerable number of bulls were taken out every year. I know, as a matter of fact, that at the present time there are orders in this country for probably 100,000 *l.* worth of shorthorns for Australia if the restrictions could be removed.

2259. The trade with Europe has now been stopped?—To Denmark bulls are sent every year. Mr. Swan, who was in the chair the other day, could have told you that he sends a great number of bulls every year to Denmark. To Germany, to Sweden, to France, and to Belgium. One agent in my district shipped the year before last upwards of 100 bulls and heifers to Belgium. Then to Canada there is a very large export, as well as to the United States of America. Those are all closed against us at the present time; even to Japan and Nepaul, as you know yourself, they went to a small extent. That shows that the value of these cattle is so great that they are sought for from all parts of the world, to improve the cattle of other countries.

2260. And even to Ireland you had a large trade, and that has been stopped?—Ireland is stopped against us at the present time; I may state that nearly the whole of the trade of sending bulls to Ireland has been in the hands of my family for the last 60 years; very few shorthorn bulls have gone into Ireland but have gone through the medium of my family; and I think it is pretty well known that the cattle of Ireland have been increased in value to a very considerable extent during that time.

2261. Therefore, the inability to send well-bred bulls to the world in general is not only a great loss to the breeder of those bulls, but, in your estimation, is a very great loss to the consumers of meat, as the breed is not increased in

Colonel *Kingscote*—continued.

quantity as it would be if those bulls went abroad to Ireland, and to every where else?—Undoubtedly so, because the shorthorn is known to be an animal that improves every other breed of cattle in existence. I believe a witness will come here who told me, and who will tell you, that it is entirely owing to the shorthorns that have been sent from England to America, that they are now able to send us great supplies of American meat.

2262. Do you know anything about the dead meat trade yourself?—I have taken some interest in it; I have been to Liverpool, and have seen the processes of meat discharging there from the vessel.

2263. What is your opinion concerning it; do you think it can be brought in a wholesome state?—As a matter of opinion, there is not the slightest doubt about it. It comes there in as fine condition as any meat could be in.

2264. As a farmer and a producer of fat cattle yourself, do you fear the dead meat trade?—Not the slightest.

2265. But you do fear the importation of disease?—Undoubtedly so. What I should ask for is perfect free trade. We are taxed at the present time to the extent that the disease is upon us, and we never know when we are free. We cannot go into our regular system as producers of meat on account of these diseases; we are quite open to go into fair competition with all parts of the world in the dead meat trade, provided we are kept free from these diseases.

2266. And you also feel that when this disease is in this country, and restrictions are put on you, it is a very hard case upon you not only to be debarred from selling your cattle, but also to have to pay the expenses of those restrictions?—Undoubtedly so. During this last outbreak of cattle plague, no movement of fat cattle could take place from any farm to Leeds or Wakefield without a 28 days' pass; and the Danish cattle were coming to Newcastle, and only 12 hours afterwards they could be sent to all parts of the country. Therefore, we were labouring under a very great disadvantage.

Mr. *French.*

2267. You said a few moments ago that between 1869 and 1872, owing to foot-and-mouth disease, your herd dwindled down to half; how did you lose those animals?—Breeding animals are particularly liable to abortion by disease. I will give an instance: In 1872 I had 17 cows in one pasture, and they all went down with disease, and the produce of the whole of those 17 cows was one calf. Against that I may set the present year, when we are perfectly healthy, and I have upwards of 40 calves on the farm at the present time.

2268. Do you think that that was entirely owing to foot-and-mouth disease?—Entirely so. I have not the slightest hesitation in saying so.

2269. In your experience, have you never known cattle to slip their calves in that way without having foot-and-mouth disease?—They do occasionally.

2270. Do you not find it contagious in those cases?—Undoubtedly.

2271. Is it not within the bounds of possibility that it may not have been foot-and-mouth disease?—Certainly not, because we take every precaution; as soon as we find a cow going wrong we remove it at once.

Mr. *Booth.*

6 June 1877.

Mr. *French*—continued.

2272. You are suffering a great deal of loss at present, I believe, from the restrictions which are in force?—We are suffering inconvenience rather than loss, because meat is higher at the present time than it has ever been before. I, as a breeder, am suffering from not being able to send my cattle wherever I like, not being able to export shorthorns to Australia or even to Ireland.

2273. But the taxes to keep out the disease are higher than they would be at another time; and not only that, but I understand you to say that you will lose your custom with regard to bulls and everything this year?—So far as Ireland is concerned, I do.

2274. Is not that so with regard to the rest of the country?—Ireland has shut her doors against the whole of this country.

2275. But is not England also shut against you, for instance, in Yorkshire?—It was at one time, at least certain districts; I do not say that the whole of England was, because some districts in England never adopted the cattle plague regulations; but those districts that adopted the cattle plague regulations undoubtedly shut their doors against my cattle going there.

2276. Are the regulations in force in your neighbourhood?—They cease to day, I believe.

Mr. *Pease.*

2277. How long has Yorkshire been shut?—Since the outbreak at Hull in January.

2278. For those four months you have been under a cordon?—Yes.

2279. Before that time you had a long period in which there were no restrictions whatever, had you not?—Quite so.

2280. How long has Australia been shut against you?—Since 1871 or 1872, I think; since the time that the foot-and-mouth disease raged so in this country; I think from 1869 to 1872 there was one continuous stream of foot-and-mouth disease running round the country, you may say.

2281. How long has America been shut?—Only since the outbreak of cattle plague, and Canada the same.

2282. Therefore, so far as America and Canada are concerned, your complaint only dates back to January?—It dates back to the time of the outbreak of cattle plague at Hull, or rather in England.

2283. To the last outbreak in Germany?—To the last outbreak in Germany.

2284. With regard to Ireland, it is the same thing, is it not?—As soon as the cattle plague broke out on this side, the import of stock into Ireland ceased.

2285. Therefore, so far as your complaint goes, it only dates back to the outbreak which came in from the continent, except as regards Australia?—Exactly so.

2286. Have you any idea how long the Australian regulation will be continued?—I believe that at the present time it is proposed to continue it until 1880.

2287. Then whatever regulation we might come to in this country would not affect that colony?—I have reason to believe that it would. If we were once declared free from disease in this country, Australia would be ready to receive animals from us.

2288. How long do you think that they would wish us to be in quarantine, supposing that we were to stop the entire importation of all foreign cattle into this country?—It is impossible for me to say; it is rather a matter within the province of the Australian people themselves; but I know, as a matter of fact, that it was proposed to take off the restrictions in June this year, if it had not been for the outbreak of cattle plague at the present time.

Mr. *Pease*—continued.

2289. On the presumption that Yorkshire has now removed the stoppages to your trade, do you not suppose that America, Canada, and Ireland will all follow?—I suppose they will; but if we have a further outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease, as regards the Colonies we shall be closed.

2290. Have you read Professor Brown's evidence before this Committee?—I have.

2291. Do you agree with him that, whatever we may do with regard to continental cattle, we shall have outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia?—Not altogether. A Return has been made which shows that in the last three years we had 1,400 cargoes of imported disease out of a total of more than 12,000; and Professor Brown and Professor Simonds have confessed that, from the time of the incubation of the disease to the time of its being able to be discovered, a very great number of cargoes must have escaped the inspectors. In fact, we know as a matter of fact that after the cattle have passed the inspector it has been discovered in the London market, and I have no doubt that many of those cattle escape into the country and spread the disease.

2292. How long is it since you were at Liverpool inspecting the arrival of the American meat?—In April.

2293. Had you heard at that time whether there was any probability of the American dead meat trade ceasing?—Certainly not.

2294. Have you seen the evidence which was given, the last time this Committee sat, upon that question?—I heard Mr. Swan's evidence, but I do not think it is worth much. I think two or three days will convince you to the contrary.

2295. You do not believe in it?—Certainly not.

Mr. *Chamberlain.*

2296. I understand that, since the outbreak until to-day, no live cattle have been permitted to leave the North Riding?—No live cattle except for slaughter. It was simply within the radius of Yorkshire; but the western counties of England, to speak more correctly, such as Westmorland and Cumberland, that were lying away from the cattle plague district, would admit breeding animals from certain districts with a 28 days' pass.

2297. Then, if the counties of Westmorland and Cumberland would do it, and could do so wisely, might not all other counties have done the same?—The fear of the spread of disease was such that they did not think it necessary to do so. In fact, Cheshire closed itself for 40 days, and Gloucestershire, I think, for 28 days. The local authorities in each different district do not always take the same view of the matter, and they act according to their own ideas.

2298. Therefore the fear of cattle plague, or of the possibility of infection, differs very much in different districts?—Yes; I suppose it was thought in Westmorland that we in the North Riding

Mr. *Chamberlain*—continued.

Riding had taken such precautions to prevent the production of cattle plague into the North Riding that they might allow us, under certain conditions, and with 28 days' good health, to send cattle there; but whilst they would do that, we would not receive any from them.

2299. Do you think that it would be safe in all cases to allow the movement of animals from an infected district with a pass from a qualified inspector?—No, certainly not.

2300. It must be left, then, to local discretion to decide whether, and under what conditions, they will receive cattle from an infected district?—I hardly understand the question.

2301. At the present time, as I understand, each local authority exercises its own discretion as to whether it will receive any cattle from a district in which cattle plague is supposed to exist?—Yes.

2302. And you think that that must continue?—It undoubtedly must continue if the cattle plague is in the country, unless, as I should recommend, the Government take the matter into their hands entirely, and supersede the local authorities, as they did in the recent instance in London.

2303. Do you think that Westmorland and Cumberland at the present time are running any risk in taking your cattle with a 28 days' pass?—Certainly not, from the North Riding, because we have taken every precaution that we could to get rid of the disease, and so long as the disease was in the East Riding it would have been quite safe for any animals to have gone from the North Riding to any other part of England.

2304. Confining it entirely to the North Riding, you think that there was no risk in the case of the regulations made by Westmoreland and Cumberland, and therefore you see it follows that the regulations which other counties made, and by which your cattle were excluded, were unnecessary?—They did not think so; they were simply protecting themselves against the spread of the disease. The disease was brought into Hull, and the utmost alarm prevailed at once; and a deputation waited upon the Duke of Richmond, and asked him to prohibit the York market, and to close the East Riding, and he did so within a few hours; and had it not been so, the cattle would have probably gone from Hull to York, and would have been distributed all through the country. Therefore we in the North Riding immediately took what measures we could to prevent those animals coming upon us. We suffered very considerably in 1865 and 1867 from disease; no district of England perhaps, except Cheshire, suffered more, and we knew from sad experience that the best thing that we could do was to prohibit movement.

2305. Where the matter is left to local discretion it is probable, is it not, that some authorities, at any rate, may exercise unnecessary stringency?—I should not like to say that.

2306. If Westmoreland and Cumberland were right in not adopting those regulations, must not other counties have been wrong?—I should not like to say so.

2307. On the whole, do you consider that the advantage of these stringent regulations outweighs the disadvantage?—I think, undoubtedly, whilst we have to put up with inconvenience to keep out the disease, it is much more to our advantage to bear the cost of these restrictions than to have the disease brought in upon us. The same with foot-and-mouth disease; we are willing to undergo the greatest restrictions to stamp out foot-and-mouth disease, if we can get quit of it.

Mr. *Chamberlain*—continued.

2308. You say that these restrictions have raised the price of meat in the North Riding; do you know to what extent that effect has been produced?—I have sold cattle myself in the last 10 days at 9 *d.* a pound; that is a rise of 1 *d.* a pound since Christmas. Meat at Christmas, in the North Riding, was about 1 *d.* a pound lower.

2309. These restrictions were brought into existence when the cattle plague broke out, were they not?—Yes, in January.

2310. Have you ever had similar restrictions as against foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia at a time when the cattle plague was not in the country?—No.

2311. Is the transit of animals free at other times when there is no cattle plague?—I do not recollect the regulations just now, but no diseased cattle are allowed to be moved, if they are known to be diseased, subject to penalties.

2312. Have you been allowed to move healthy cattle without any restriction at a time when foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia were prevalent in the country?—Undoubtedly so.

2313. That is not so in all towns, is it?—No restriction has been adopted in the North Riding, beyond the fact that you cannot move diseased animals. I should like to point out to the Committee that in the year 1875 I had an attack of foot-and-mouth disease on my farm, and in six fields by the roadside animals were ill with foot-and-mouth disease; I was prohibited from removing those animals, but any other man could drive his cattle along the lane, past the animals that were diseased, without let or hindrance; so that he might actually take the disease all through the country from my cattle, and, in fact, I have no doubt that my cattle got it in that way.

Mr. *Norwood.*

2314. I understand that you are willing to submit to severe restrictions in case of need?—Yes, in order to stamp out foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia.

2315. And those severe restrictions enhance the price of your cattle, do they not?—For the time they might, but I believe that the effect will eventually be to lower the price of meat, and we shall be quite ready to sell it at a lower price, because we can produce it at a cheaper rate.

2316. Then this advance of 1 *d.* per lb. is only temporary?—The advance of 1 *d.* per lb. is only temporary on account of the restrictions; I think that it will probably be found within the next few weeks that our markets will go down again. Of course that is a mere commercial matter of supply and demand.

2317. Then you, naturally, view Hull with a considerable amount of anxiety and suspicion with regard to the disease?—Undoubtedly so.

2318. Are you aware that evidence was given in this room a few days ago, that there was no absolute mathematical certainty that there was cattle plague in Hull at all this year?—I have read all the evidence given here, and I am not aware of anything of that kind having been stated.

2319. Are

Mr. *Booth.*

6 June 1877.

Mr. *Norwood*—continued.

2319. Are you aware that Professor Brown stated that he was not absolutely confident that a true case of rinderpest had occurred at Hull this year?—I cannot put that construction upon what I have read of his evidence.

Mr. *M'Lagan.*

2320. Is that rise of 1 *d.* per lb. in the price of beef due to the restrictions, or is it due simply to the difference in the season?—It is due to the restrictions at present, I think.

2321. Is beef not generally dearer at this time of the year?—It has risen within the last two months. Up to May it is generally low, and then in June and July it rises, and then it fluctuates according to the supply.

2322. I understand from your evidence that you would advocate the prohibition of the importation of all live-stock into this country?—Undoubtedly so. We are quite prepared to put up with the restrictions on our own cattle to stamp out diseases, providing that the risk of importing foreign disease is also taken away.

2323. And you would allow the free importation of dead meat?—Undoubtedly so.

2324. Have you ever considered what would be the effect upon the price of beef in this market if you prohibited the importation of live-stock, and allowed the importation of dead meat alone?—It is hardly a question that I have considered.

2325. Do you think that it would have the effect of raising the price of beef?—I cannot see why it should. You can bring the carcase at a cheaper rate than you can bring the live animal.

2326. Speaking as a practical farmer, your reason for advocating the prohibition of the importation of live-stock, and the free importation of dead meat, is not that it will raise the price of beef, but that you wish to protect your own stock?—Yes. As I said just now to an honourable Member, I would sooner sell my beef at a cheaper rate if I were able to produce it cheaper, and I know I can produce it cheaper by being free from disease.

2327. There has been a considerable rise in the price of beef and dairy produce in the last 10 or 15 years, has there not?—Undoubtedly; since there was such very great prosperity in many of our trades, there are more beefeaters in the country.

2328. You think that the rise in the price of meat has arisen more from the greater consumption of meat than from the scarcity of cattle on account of disease?—I think that we, as producers of cattle, could not only produce meat cheaper in the future, but we could have produced a greater quantity of meat in this country in the last 10 or 15 years if we had been free from disease. Take my cattle on my farm at the present time; they should go to market in August; supposing at that time they break out with foot-and-mouth disease, they go down, and I am obliged probably to keep them till the Christmas following. Hence I am only able to feed off one lot, when I could have fed two lots.

2329. The risk of producing beef now by the farmers of this country is far greater than it used to be, is it not?—Undoubtedly so.

2330. And the loss that the farmers experience from cattle dying from disease is greater than it used to be?—I think it is; the outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease from 1869 to 1872 were more severe than any I ever knew. I believe Professor Simonds stated that it was more severe in 1841, but the losses from death were more from 1869 to 1872 than I ever knew in my experience, because, as a rule, it produces abortion in cows, and takes their milk away, and cripples them for a time; but those animals in three or four months' time will perhaps come round again, but at that time numbers of animals were actually killed by the disease.

Mr. *M'Lagan*—continued.

2331. Then on account of that risk and loss the price of beef has been enhanced?—I think so, unduly.

2332. Have you had any fatal cases of foot-and-mouth disease?—At the time I named, five or six of my best animals pined away, as we term it. The disease was so severe upon them that it went into the feet, and they became prostrate; then the digestive organs ceased to operate, and they subsequently died.

2333. But the foot-and-mouth disease is not generally reckoned a fatal disease, is it?—Not as a rule.

2334. But though it is not a fatal disease, the loss from the disease is very great, on account of the loss of condition in the animal?—Yes; the loss from the disease is very great on that account, and from the hindrance we are put to, in not being able to get them fat at the proper time.

2335. Do you think you could prevent foot-and-mouth disease if there were no importation of live-stock?—I do not see why we should not. Professor Brown told me, individually, that we should have foot-and-mouth disease all through this country this spring; and he has since told me that the restrictions that have been put on in consequence of the cattle plague have stopped his prophesied outbreak.

2336. Is it not invariably the case that when you have any very great restrictions with regard to any particular disease you have fewer cases of all other diseases?—Undoubtedly. It was the same in 1867 and in 1877 in the country; I do not know what it was in London.

2337. Therefore, as a practical farmer, you would approve of these restrictions, were it for nothing else than the general advantage of the country?—Undoubtedly so.

Mr. *Elliot.*

2338. You are a member of the Yorkshire Agricultural Society as well as of the Royal Agricultural Society, are you not?—Yes, I am on the council.

2339. Have you read Professor Brown's and Professor Simonds' evidence?—Both.

2340. What is your opinion as to the way in which the proposed restrictions would be received by the farmers of your district?—I believe that the opinions of the farmers of the country are quite changed as regards the foot-and-mouth disease from what they were six or seven years ago, and that they would now hail with pleasure any restrictions which they see to be necessary, because we know that the cattle plague restrictions have almost succeeded in stamping it out; but I also believe that were those restrictions continued at the present time, as Professor Brown proposes, in districts were there is foot-and-mouth disease, it might be eventually stamped out altogether.

2341. You

Mr. *Elliot*—continued.

2341. You have been an abnormal loser by foot-and-mouth disease, have you not?—Very large indeed.

2342. Can you give the Committee any idea of what your monetary loss has been in the last 20 years?—It is rather a large sum; certainly somewhere between 30,000 *l.* and 40,000 *l.*, I should think, speaking moderately.

2343. You say that the increase in the number of cattle in Ireland has been mainly owing to the introduction of shorthorns there?—We claim that my family have done more for Ireland than many other people have done. For 60 years we have had the whole of the shorthorn bull trade in our hands.

2344. Can you state the approximate amount of the increase of the exportation from Ireland to this country in the last few years?—I have not seen the returns, but I have understood when I have been in Ireland that the cattle in the last 25 years have increased to about four times the value.

Mr. *Torr*.

2345. Do you think that it would be possible to stamp out the foot-and-mouth disease in England?—I think so, because, as I have already stated, the present cattle plague restrictions have shown that it is so.

2346. Of course it would be at great cost?—I think we should not grumble at the cost. I think the cost of stamping out foot-and-mouth disease would be nothing as compared with the loss that we have suffered from the disease.

2347. Do you think that the supply of beef to this country will be ultimately increased or decreased by our precautions?—I am quite certain that we could produce a great deal more meat in this country if we were free from disease.

2348. You think, then, that at whatever cost the foot-and-mouth disease was stamped out, it would be a great gain to the food production of this country?—Undoubtedly.

2349. To the large towns it would be a great gain?—I am certain of it.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*.

2350. You say that you think that the present cattle plague restrictions have stopped the foot-and-mouth disease?—I have Professor Brown's word for it.

2351. In what counties of England are those restrictions?—I do not know at the present time. I believe there are very few centres at the present time. I think only one in the West Riding, and none in the North Riding or East Riding.

2352. Is it not the case that those restrictions only exist in two or three of the counties of England?—At the present time they exist only in a few, but they have been in force in a great part of England during the last three or four months.

2353. This year?—Yes. You have a better knowledge upon the subject, no doubt, than I have, but I have not studied the number of the counties that have put the restrictions in force.

2354. I have no special knowledge upon the subject, but my impression was that, by order of the Privy Council, these restrictions were ordered for one of the Ridings of Yorkshire, to Lincolnshire, and to Essex?—But the local authorities of the different counties put the restrictions in force themselves without the authority of the Privy Council.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

2355. Is it not the case that it has been only done in two or three counties?—No; I am open to correction, but, speaking off-hand, I should say that they have been in force in three-fourths of England at least, and I think in Scotland as well.

2356. Supposing that it should turn out that they were only in force in a few counties, you would acknowledge that foot-and-mouth disease cannot have been stopped in England by the restriction?—It must depend upon whether there was foot-and-mouth disease existing in those counties to begin with.

2357. Do you think that England is free from foot-and-mouth disease at the present time?—It never has been so free, I believe, for many years.

2358. You have paid great attention to the history of these disease, I believe; has it not been frequently the case, that you have had years very much without foot-and-mouth disease?—Not altogether; it ebbs and flows, undoubtedly.

2359. Although that has been very much the case, the country has never been absolutely free?—I am not aware that it has.

2360. I suppose you have paid enough attention to the subject to be aware that foot-and-mouth disease first appeared in England at the time that the import from the Continent was prohibited?—Yes, but I believe it was accounted for by appearing first very near London, where ships' stores might have escaped. Professor Simonds stated, I believe, something of that kind.

2361. I understand that what you would advise is, that there should be a total prohibition of the import of live cattle from the Continent?—I should like to see it. I am one of those who believe that eventually the whole trade of this country must be dead meat.

2362. Do you advise that that should be done?—I advise that that should be done, and failing total prohibition, I should prohibit the import from those countries which had any disease whatever, either foot-and-mouth disease, pleuro-pneumonia, or cattle plague.

2363. You think that the farmers of England would be willing to submit to very strong restrictions, in order to stamp out pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease?—I do.

2364. And after that time you would like to have entire free trade as between one part of England and the other?—I should.

2365. What would you do with the Irish import?—I should treat Ireland exactly as I should treat England.

2366. You would have the same reliance upon the present regulations in Ireland through the Government at Dublin as you would have upon the regulations in England?—I believe that the Irish regulations differ from those in force in England; they are under a rather different system of government, but I have no doubt that they could take sufficient measures in Ireland as in England if the same law applied to the whole country.

2367. Would you be prepared to stamp out foot-and-mouth disease by slaughter?—No; I think that Professor Brown's proposal of declaring a district infected, and totally stopping the movement of cattle in that district, would be sufficient.

Mr. *Booth.*

6 June 1877.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

2368. I think that in 1874 the Privy Council renewed the permission to the local authorities in different counties to have more stringent regulations with regard to foot-and-mouth disease; has the North Riding availed itself of that permission?—No; I am not aware of any measures that have been taken to put that in force.

2369. You have no regulations except those that are compelled by the Act?—The regulations are simply as to the stoppage of the movement of diseased animals.

2370. When had you foot-and-mouth disease prevailing last in the North Riding?—In 1875 it prevailed very generally.

2371. Did it prevail last year?—Not so much.

2372. Then it could hardly be the regulations with regard to cattle plague which has stopped the foot-and-mouth disease in the North Riding this year?—The foot-and-mouth disease, since the cattle plague regulations have been put in force, has disappeared in the North Riding.

2373. To what extent had you it before?—That I cannot tell you. I have no data to go by.

2374. I suppose that practically you have not had much trouble with it since 1875?—It has simply gone on, and we have taken no notice of it.

2375. But you, with your great attention to the subject and your great interest in the matter, would take notice of it, I presume, if it were there?—No doubt I should, if it were in my neighbourhood; but it has not been in my neighbourhood, and I have not, therefore, gone into the question.

2376. Do you make the suggestion that the import of live cattle should be prohibited because you fear the introduction of cattle plague, or because you wish to stop pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease?—I assume, from Mr. Elliot's Return (I think it was), that some 1,500 cargoes of diseased cattle came in in the last three years, and altogether there were 12,000 cargoes of some kind or other imported; and I think that we have reason to assume, knowing the length of time before foot-and-mouth disease, and those other diseases, appear, that many cargoes escape the notice of the inspectors. It has been acknowledged that inspection is of no use whatever.

2377. If there was no such disease as cattle plague, you would still strongly press this suggestion that live cattle should be prohibited?—I should.

2378. It is mainly upon the evils that come from pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease that you base that suggestion?—I am certain, in my own mind, that the consumers of meat in this country are far greater losers by having disease in the country, than they would be if we could breed a greater number of animals, and feed a greater number of animals, in a healthy state.

2379. And you have full confidence that, if import was stopped, you would be liable to get rid of those two diseases?—The stoppage of the import would minimise the risks.

2380. You believe that you would be able to get rid of it?—I think so.

2381. And you are not one of those who believe that those two diseases are now acclimatised in England?—They may be acclimatised to a certain extent, but still I think that they are foreign diseases, and I agree with Professor Brown that it is possible to stamp them out.

2382. Do you consider the statement true, that in no country in which these diseases have really taken root have they ever yet been stopped?—I think that Professor Müller stated something to that effect, but I do not know that they have taken any strict measures to stamp it out. The last witness just now stated, I think, that it had been stamped out in Schleswig-Holstein. There have been outbreaks, but they have put their finger upon them at once. I think the gentleman from Schleswig stated that there had been several outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease, and that the measures taken by the Government are sufficient to stamp it out.

2383. Did you read the evidence given in 1873?—I did not.

2384. Therefore you are not aware of the statement which was made by the witnesses then, that no country had succeeded in stamping it out?—I am not aware.

2385. And that exceedingly stringent measures have been taken in Switzerland without success?—I am not aware of the fact.

2386. Independently of your very costly herd, which is so well known, besides breeding those very valuable animals, you also breed what we may consider animals for the general market, do you not?—Yes, I do.

2387. And consequently you sometimes send a considerable number of animals to market to sell?—Yes; Leeds and Wakefield are our principal markets.

2388. Supposing that one of those animals happened to have foot-and-mouth disease that animal would be obliged to be slaughtered?—It would be obliged to be slaughtered.

2389. But to all the animals that had been in contact with it nothing would be done?—Nothing; the disease would remain to develop itself.

2390. Comparing your position in sending these cattle to market with that of an importer from the continent, I suppose that you are aware that if one importer sends 20 animals on board a steamer to London, and if other importers send other 80, making up 100, and that if one of those other animals has the foot-and-mouth disease the whole of the hundred are killed?—Yes, I believe that is so.

2391. Therefore is it not the case that the regulations with regard to animals which are affected by foot-and-mouth disease coming from abroad are at this moment very much more stringent than they are upon the home producers?—Undoubtedly they are to that extent, and that is the reason why I advocate total prohibition. I think they had far better send the meat from the other side and have done with the annoyance which your question suggests.

2392. You are quite aware of the fact that the Government takes very much greater pains at the present moment to prevent disease coming from abroad than it does to prevent disease, at any rate, foot-and mouth disease, being spread from one district to another?—It does to the extent of killing diseased animals, or animals that have been in contact with diseased animals; and I believe that a great number of other animals escape the inspectors that are never condemned at all. Probably far more animals escape

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

escape than are caught. I have a right, I think, to assume that.

2393. Do you not think that a great number of the animals that go into Islington Market go away from it and escape detection?—It has been discovered in the Islington Market after they have passed the inspector.

2394. Do you not think that the same remark would apply to home animals going to Islington Market, that a good many animals would go there with foot-and-mouth disease, and go out without its being discovered, and affect other parts of the country?—I think that if an animal has foot-and-mouth disease in the Islington Market it is seized at once.

2395. My reason for asking that question is that you said that you thought that foreign animals that had foot-and-mouth disease escaped detection; probably the disease had not fully developed itself; do you not think that the same remark may apply to the home animals?—It may to a certain extent, but I ask that Professor Brown's restrictions shall be put in force, and that if there is an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease all movement should be stopped.

2396. Are you in the habit of buying animals that come from Ireland?—Never.

2397. But you know farmers that do, do you not?—Yes.

2398. And I suppose that they frequently buy them at an English market?—Yes.

2399. Do you not think it likely that animals that come to that market had foot-and-mouth disease, but that nobody has found it out?—Undoubtedly so.

2400. But those animals are spreading disease in the same way as animals that come from abroad, are they not?—Yes; but I should put Ireland under the same ban as England, and stop the foot-and-mouth disease in Ireland. I believe that it is imported into Ireland. I do not believe that it is generated there, as was stated by Mr. Swan. A large number of calves are sent over there every year, and I believe that those calves in a great measure take foot-and-mouth disease to Ireland.

2401. Supposing that the import of live animals was prohibited, and that the Government were then to set to work to stamp out foot-and-mouth disease in these two islands, what would be the regulations which you would propose for stamping it out?—Simply the regulations that are now in force, except the killing. I should stop the movement of all cattle in infected districts.

2402. For all England?—No; in the districts. I should draw a cordon around a certain district where it might be thought necessary by the Veterinary Department of the Privy Council, and stop the movement of cattle in that district.

2403. What would you do with the large markets?—If necessary I should not hesitate to stop them for the time being. There are always sources of supply of meat.

2404. Would not that really imply the stoppage of all the large markets?—It does not follow at all.

2405. Take the market at Norwich-hill; supposing that foot-and-mouth disease was in the county of Norfolk (I do not know whether it is or not), do you still think that you would have any chance of stamping out the disease if you allowed any cattle to go to Norwich?—If the foot-

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

and-mouth disease broke out in the district of Norfolk, I should stop the market at once.

2406. My object is to find out what would be the inconvenience to the trade generally of those stamping-out regulations, and therefore I want to know what you consider that it would be necessary to do; do you think it would be enough merely to stop the markets where you knew that foot-and-mouth disease was existing?—I should not allow an animal to be removed outside a district in which foot-and-mouth disease was prevalent. I should take a certain large area, and then stop the total movement of cattle in that district, as is done in Germany in case of an outbreak of cattle plague.

2407. The reason why I ask this question is, that the witnesses whom we examined in 1873, Professor Brown and one or two others, gave a very strong opinion, that it is useless to attempt to stamp out foot-and-mouth diseases, by stopping movement in only one part of the island, but that it must be stopped everywhere?—I do not think that that is Professor Brown's opinion now, and it is not mine.

2408. On the 15th May last, I asked him this question with regard to foot-and-mouth disease, "You say that you do not believe that the stock owners of the country would comply with the restrictions that would be necessary?"; and he replies, "That is my conviction. If those regulations were enforced, what people in this country call free trade, that is to say, the right which every man possesses to drive a bullock in any direction he likes, and to any market, and to as many markets as he pleases, must necessarily be totally interrupted, and I do not believe that traders generally would put up with those restrictions." You do not think that it would be necessary to have the trade totally interrupted?—I think that it should only be done in the district where foot-and-mouth disease existed.

2409. With regard to pleuro-pneumonia, how would you hope to stamp it out?—There have been certain regulations in force, as to slaughtering in cases of pleuro-pneumonia, and I believe that those regulations, in the country at any rate (I do not know how it is in London), have considerably reduced the outbreaks in the kingdom, but pleuro-pneumonia would undoubtedly come under the same regulations as cattle plague or foot-and-mouth disease.

2410. How long do you think it requires for pleuro-pneumonia to develop itself so as to be visible?—I have no experience whatever; I never saw a case that I am aware of.

2411. I asked Professor Brown this question: "I daresay that you will remember, that before the last Committee, there were some witnesses who stated that they thought that stopping the movement of cattle for six weeks, would enable foot-and-mouth disease to be stamped out of the island"; to which Professor Brown says, "I remember that statement." Then I asked him, "You are not of opinion that that time would be anything like enough?"; and he answered, "Certainly not; if we could do it in six years, I should think the work would be very well done." Supposing that Professor Brown is right in that, do you think that the farmers of England would bear a restriction of movement for six years?—I should think so, because it would only apply to such districts as the foot-and-mouth disease was prevailing in at the time.

2412. Supposing

Mr. *Booth.*

6 June 1877.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

2412. Supposing that Professor Brown is also right in his statement that the movement would require to be totally interrupted, do you think that the farmers would stand it?—I do not think that that is his opinion.

2413. Do you think that, supposing it to be the case that throughout a good part of England the movement would require to be stopped for six years, the farmers would bear it?—I do not contemplate such a thing at all; I think that wherever an outbreak occurs, if movement in that district is stopped we shall get quit of it in less time.

Chairman.

2414. With regard to these regulations, I understand you to say that you consider that pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease might be stamped out by applying similar regulations to the places where the disease was discovered to exist to those which were in force with regard to cattle plague?—Undoubtedly so.

2415. And though it might be a slow process, still if those regulations were applied wherever the disease was discovered in time, you would be able to eradicate it from the country?—I think quite so.

2416. You found that supposition very much upon what was known to be the fact at the time of the outbreak in 1865, 1866, and 1867, when the cattle plague restrictions which were in existence for a long period did almost entirely eradicate the disease?—Almost entirely, I believe.

2417. And also upon the fact that when in Denmark and in Schleswig-Holstein they have had outbreaks of both these diseases, pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease, they have, by the application of similar restrictions, eradicated both those diseases, and are practically free from them at the present moment?—That has very much strengthened my opinion.

2418. And you state further that you believe, from your acquaintance with the farmers as a body, that they would be prepared to submit to such restrictions, the end in view being entire and absolute freedom from those diseases?—I think that they would submit to that.

2419. On the ground that if by those regulations, combined with a restriction of importation, these diseases were once eradicated from the country, it is probable that they would not break out again?—That is my opinion.

2420. It has been stated that these diseases existed in this country before the importation of foreign cattle took place; I understand you to say that you believe still that they originated from the continent, because ships' stores were disembarked at most ports, and they might have been the cause of its introduction?—Yes; I only know from what I have read of what Professor Brown said.

2421. I was under the impression that Professor Brown had said that he had changed his opinion with regard to the entire suppression of the disease. The Right honourable gentleman the Member for Bradford has pointed out to me that, in answer to Question 547, Professor Brown said that he was decidedly of opinion that the movement of cattle must be restricted with regard to the whole of the country. If that was not carried out you would still be of opinion that, by doing it by degrees, although taking

Chairman—continued.

longer, you would eventually eradicate those diseases?—I think so. Professor Brown also stated that he believed that the country would never stand it. He took rather a strong view of it; but I think that he has misapprehended the feeling of the country at the present time.

2422. Your impression being, that whilst the farmers may have, as a body, objected to these restrictions some years back, yet that, from their losses, and from the diminution of their profits, they have changed their minds, and are prepared to submit to such restrictions?—Undoubtedly so.

2423. With regard to the import from abroad, the opinion which Professor Brown expressed to the Committee was, that whilst prohibiting, absolutely, the import from Germany and Belgium, the unscheduled countries, such as Denmark, and Spain, and Schleswig-Holstein, should be allowed still to send their cattle into this country free; you are not of that opinion?—I look for a total dead-meat trade.

2424. Looking to the fact that it has been shown that from Denmark a very large trade exists, and that that country is almost absolutely free from all these diseases, and that there are protections as against the import of disease into that country which are far more stringent than any that we ourselves attempt, do you think that, under those circumstances, you would be obliged to prohibit the import of live cattle from that country?—I think if you do not restrict altogether those countries that take such severe measures to keep down the disease, they are the only ones that should be allowed to send live cattle; but in the case of an outbreak of disease in any one of those countries either of pleuro-pneumonia or of foot-and-mouth disease, I should immediately prohibit the importation of stock from that country.

2425. I understand you to say that whilst, perhaps, it might be advisable, where countries could prove their immunity from disease by their own restrictions, to allow of the trade being continued with those countries, it would be sufficient, in that case, to protect ourselves by prohibiting importation on the first outbreak there?—It would minimise the risk, no doubt; but we know that, as late as last November, Denmark was supposed to be free from foot-and-mouth disease, and it appeared in Danish cattle that were imported to Newcastle.

2427. There was one instance in which seven animals were infected with foot-and-mouth disease, but it was detected?—Yes.

2426. And from the nature of foot-and-mouth disease it is generally believed that you can detect it?—I am not of that opinion at all.

2428. You stated, I think, in answer to the Right honourable gentleman, that the powers of the different localities had put in force different restrictions during the last outbreak?—During the cattle-plague outbreak it has been a general order throughout most of the kingdoms, I believe. I only know two countries in which it was not put in force: Leicester and Cornwall.

2429. Did they carry it out in the West Riding?—The markets only for fat cattle were left open at Leeds and Wakefield for a certain time, and I believe that the cattle were obliged to be branded for slaughter, to show that they could not be moved to any field. A great number of people were fined in the West Riding for moving the animals and breaking the law.

2430. There

Chairman—continued.

2430. There was a great difference in the orders of the different localities, was there not?—Undoubtedly.

2431. In your opinion is it advisable that that should continue, or that greater powers should be given to the central authority to lay down regulations at once upon any outbreak, those regulations applying equally to all districts?—I am strongly of opinion that the whole of the regulations should emanate from the Privy Council office.

2432. That is to say, that you would be willing to transfer to the central authority the power which is at present exercised by the local authority with regard to these contagious diseases?—Quite so; I think that the local authority would be quite willing to give up their power.

2433. Would you allow the inspectors to be appointed by the central authority in the various districts?—Yes, I think so. I think that they should be all subject to one head, say to Professor Brown.

2434. Do you think it would be any injustice that the cost of inspection should be a charge upon the local rates in that case?—I do not think that there would be any objection to it, but I am strongly of opinion that it should be an Imperial charge, as is the case in Germany with regard to cattle plague.

2435. I understand you to say that you would make this transfer at once by Act of Parliament altogether?—I think that you would probably have to repeal the Act of 1869.

2436. You would not bring into operation the Privy Council's powers whenever disease broke out anywhere, but you would make it generally a power to the Privy Council to deal as they saw fit in all districts with cattle diseases?—Undoubtedly so.

2437. At the same time you believe that the localities would not object to having the charges made upon the local rates for the inspection, although you yourself think that it ought to be an Imperial charge?—I do not think they would; I should not like to speak for large towns, such as London, for instance, but I believe that in the rural districts in the Quarter Sessional Divisions there would be no objection. Taking the large towns, we know sometimes they do not like having the powers taken out of their hands.

Mr. *Chaplin.*

2438. Do I correctly understand you to say that you attribute the origin of these diseases, cattle plague, pleuro-pneumonia, and foot-and-mouth disease, entirely to the importation of live stock from the Continent?—Originally, undoubtedly they were foreign diseases.

2439. Is there any plan, in your opinion, short of entire prohibition of import from countries on the Continent that have ever been infected, by which we could hope to get rid of these diseases in future altogether?—I seek to prohibit the importation of disease from foreign countries, and at the same time I wish to see it stamped out by proper regulations being put in force in this country.

2440. You think that the entire prohibition of the importation of live cattle is essential in the first place?—I would not say that there should be an entire prohibition of the importation, because where countries have no disease, and have never had any disease, as I have said to the Chairman, that would alter my opinion slightly; but wherever there was the disease in any country, I should prohibit importation from that country entirely.

Mr. *Chaplin*—continued.

2441. I am speaking only of countries where there is infection; if the importation was entirely prohibited, you have no doubt, have you, that we should get rid of those diseases altogether?—In course of time.

2442. In what space of time?—Professor Brown says six years, but I think that if an Act could be passed giving Professor Brown power, within a few weeks from this time, he could lay his hands on the disease and stamp it out in a very short time. There might be fresh outbreaks, but every fresh outbreak would be known and would be nipped in the bud.

2443. Without it being necessary to adopt the very stringent measures which he recommended throughout the whole country?—Undoubtedly so.

2444. Then you disagree with Professor Brown?—I fancy that I have put a right construction upon Professor Brown's evidence, but I should not like to be certain.

2445. You think that it would be sufficient to apply the stringent regulations to infected districts only and not to the whole country?—I do if the disease broke out in a certain district. Professor Brown proposes to have a certain number of inspectors throughout the country; he proposes to map out the country into certain divisions, with a head inspector in each district, and sub-inspectors under him. Whenever foot-and-mouth disease broke out in anyone of those districts, I should declare it infected and stop the movement of cattle within a certain area.

2446. Then you do not think it necessary to do as he says, viz., to place the most stringent regulations for a time upon the whole movement of cattle in the county, fat or lean?—I do not think that it is necessary. If he thought it necessary it might probably do it sooner, but I think that the other proposal would answer the purpose.

2447. I understood you to say, that supposing that we were freed from all risk of disease by foreign importation, you would largely increase the home-bred cattle in this country?—Undoubtedly cattle breeding has been to a great extent stopped by the prevalence of disease. Evidence will be given, I believe, by men who have actually been obliged to adopt another system of farming in consequence of these diseases.

2448. You think that the increase in the breeding of home-bred cattle would be more than sufficient to compensate for the loss by the prohibition of the importation of foreign cattle?—I think so.

2449. Supposing that the importation of live cattle from infected countries was entirely prohibited, and that the number of home-bred cattle was very largely increased in consequence of your freedom from all risk of disease, what in your opinion would be the effect upon the price of meat in this country?—It is a question of supply and demand. If there was an increased supply it must lower the price, and I could afford to sell it cheaper, because I was able to make it at a cheaper rate, the same as any manufacturer.

2450. In fact, you think that it would be a general

Mr. *Booth.*

6 June 1877.

Mr. *Chaplin*—continued.

general advantage to the consumer and to the producer as well?—Very much so indeed.

2451. Under those circumstances, do you think it at all likely that arable land would be reconverted into pasture land?—No, I do not think it would make any difference in the course of husbandry in the country.

2452. Do you remember what the rise in the price of meat was after the outbreak of cattle plague in 1865, 1866, and 1867?—I do not remember. I have never looked into the question.

2453. There was a considerable rise, I think?—I think there was, but I do not recollect what the rise was.

2454. Whatever rise there was, was entirely in consequence of that outbreak of cattle plague?—Undoubtedly.

Mr. *Arthur Peel.*

2455. What are the diseases in this country which induce foreign countries to prohibit the import of our cattle?—Foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia especially. Australia and New Zealand prohibit import on that account.

2456. They would prohibit the importation of your cattle so long as either foot-and-mouth disease or pleuro-pneumonia was in this country?—Yes.

2457. They have done that up to the year 1880, I think?—The prohibition is in force until

Mr. *Arthur Peel*—continued.

that time, but of course it is liable to be rescinded if we are free from these diseases.

2458. What are the regulations as to the Continent?—The whole of the rest of the restrictions are put in force on account of the cattle plague. The whole of the rest of the world, you may say, is shut against us on account of cattle plague.

2459. When you speak of wishing to prohibit the total importation of live stock into this country, do you mean that you would prohibit the importation as long as any of these three diseases existed?—Certainly.

2460. You would prohibit the importation of cattle from Germany as long as pleuro-pneumonia existed?—Yes.

2461. But during that prohibition you would claim free export of your own cattle?—Exactly. If we have no disease in this country, no other country has a right to say that we are dangerous to them.

2462. How do you propose to arrive at freedom from disease in this country?—By stamping it out.

2463. Until you arrive at freedom from disease in this country, you cannot expect foreign countries to take your cattle?—No; we are at the present time importing cattle from all parts of the world, and all the world is shut against us; and that is what is called free trade.

Friday, 8th June 1877.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Anderson.
Mr. Assheton.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Cameron of Lochiel.
Mr. Chaplin.
Mr. James Corry.
Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.
Mr. Elliot.
Mr. W. E. Forster.
Mr. John Holms.
Colonel Kingscote.
Mr. Murphy.
Sir Rainald Knightley.
Mr. M'Lagan.
Mr. Norwood.
Mr. Pease.
Mr. Arthur Peel.
Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.
Mr. Torr.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON, IN THE CHAIR.

The BARON FR. VON BEHR, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

2464. YOU are a large Landed Proprietor in Germany, I believe?—I am.

2465. Have you come over to this country in consequence of the discussion that has taken place, and the Committee that is now sitting on the Cattle Plague?—I have.

2466. You represent to the Committee that the German farmers are largely interested in the question?—They are.

2467. And they are interested also in the protective measures that we, in this country, take with regard to the import of cattle?—If I may be allowed to express my views upon the subject, I would first bring before the Committee some statistics. I have here a newspaper showing how very great is the import of German cattle into your country; and how much money we gain by introducing our cattle and sheep into England.

2468. Will you give the figures to the Committee?—I am sorry to say that for the year 1876 I have not the numbers; I have them only until 1875. I have no reason to doubt that in 1876 the numbers will be rather higher than lower. In the year 1875 the export from Germany to England was over 67,000 head of cattle.

2469. Do you include cattle from Schleswig-Holstein in that number?—I do. I know that I might mention it separately, but I felt myself entitled to include it. We sent over 340,000 head of sheep. Our 67,000 head of cattle brought us in nearly a million and a half of guineas. In the last five years, including 1875, we received 206,000,000 marks for our cattle and sheep from England. That is rather a great sum for us. Then there is another thing still more important with regard to that. When the cattle-dealer inspects my flock of wethers he calculates as follows:—Well, of these 100 about 30 are good enough for London market, and will give me a high price, about 40 will go to France, the rest remains in the country. If he knows that for those 30 of them he will get paid very highly in England, then of course he can buy the whole, at a good price; if not, not. So that it is of the

Chairman—continued.

greatest importance to have free entrance for our cattle and sheep into England. I ask permission to read a very few lines from a book which appeared two years ago, which was published by the Cobden Club. I have a notion that the name of the Chevalier de Bunsen is still very well known in England, it is his son, who is not interested in any way in this matter, except as a member of the German Parliament, who, not knowing what would happen, wrote, two years ago, something which, if the Committee will allow me, I will read: "As for the Chancellor of the German Empire, you are aware, gentlemen, that with him the love of Free Trade is not an acquired taste, for the landed gentry of Prussia are essentially Free Traders." G. von Bunsen continues: "Will you pardon me, however, if, at the close of this far too lengthy epistle, I try to explain why, at its beginning, I qualified my statement by saying that I could apprehend no serious or lasting retrogression. Notice should, I believe, be taken of two complaints of the landed gentry of Prussia, to whom I have just referred as being natural allies of the Cobden Club. They have a grievance of old standing against English legislation, and a new one; both are affecting their purses seriously; a cry for reprisals is beginning to be listened to more readily by them every year, and I am bound to confess that a temporary backsliding on the road of Free Trade in the German Parliament, by a combination of this and some manufacturing interests, may be the result. Of course I am speaking of the manner in which English revenue is raised on spirits, and of certain measures caused by the advent of rinderpest. It has been said, and said with truth, that the conclusions which led to the preservation of the former, and to the introduction of the latter, had nothing whatever to do with protection; and I am unable to judge whether or not protection of the English distiller in the one case, and of the English cattle breeder in the other, is indeed the effect of those measures. If, however, they should, on renewed

Baron *Fr. von Behr.*

8 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

examination, be found to have that effect, who would doubt the efficacy of that wise and sound principle which the late Mr. Cobden rendered dominant in the councils of Great Britain, to wipe out from her statute book obnoxious excrescences which weaken the hands of well-wishers and Free Traders abroad." I wish to show that if I represent to-day that any restriction in the cattle trade would be felt to press very hardly upon German farmers, it is not a dream of to-day only, but this is an old feeling of ours.

2470. You represent, then, that the German farmers look with great anxiety to any restrictions on the export of cattle from Germany to this country?—Certainly.

2471. You also state to the Committee that you believe that it would not only affect the actual trade which you have with this country, but that, in the way which you have described, it would affect your trade with France also, because you have spoken of the butchers coming to select the cattle from your herd, and buying for the French market as well as for the English market?—Yes, our herds pay better if the butchers can send the best to England, because the average price is higher in England.

2472. You have heard, of course, of this new idea of a dead-meat trade?—I have.

2473. Have you considered, with regard to your German farmers, whether they would go into a dead-meat trade?—We have been thinking about that for several years. I know by my newspapers, that the whole import of dead-meat to Great Britain in the first three months of this year was about 500,000 hundred weight, the value being 1,250,000 *l.* sterling. From this the United States sent 360,000 hundred weight the value being about 1,000,000 *l.* sterling; but I do not know whether the United States have any profit from it; I should hardly believe it. As the "Times" from yesterday tells me, you had a witness the day before yesterday who told you that the profit was doubtful. I cannot but imagine that preparing a ship with a sort of arctic saloon in it must be most costly, and the smallest hole into such a saloon would spoil the whole cargo. Then, again, the transport, on this side, from the ship to town would be very costly. If I am correctly informed about that. American meat, about 30 per cent., on an average, has to be thrown away; a great deal is sold at half-price, and only about 30 per cent. pays really what it costs in America. Now, I know that as Americans have millions of acres of best grass-land in the far west, costing 1 *s.* an acre, they can breed cattle very cheaply, which we cannot do in our country, and which you cannot do here.

2474. Can you tell the Committee what is the wholesale price of cattle in your country, comparing it with the prices which are given for the American cattle before they are sent over?—It differs very much according to the time of the year, and whether the cattle are very fat, and so on. There can be no accurate comparison, but certainly we cannot sell the meat so cheaply as the Americans can.

2475. Then you represent to the Committee that, looking at the cost of your cattle before you kill it, if you add to that cost the outlay which is employed in these new ice chambers, and the freight of the dead meat, it would make the trade so unremunerative that your farmers would not go into it; is that what you wish to say?—I do not only wish to say that but to prove it, and I have good proof of it; if it were possible to bring it over from Germany, why should we not have done it already? The late Mr Williams, the Secretary of the Veterinary Department here, said at Vienna, that it made a difference of 2 *l.* whether we send a head of cattle to Deptford or to London; if we could profitably have sent the meat directly to London, should we not have done so? Why should we have sent cattle to Deptford? I think that is a good proof, but I can get another. What should we do with the offal? I was very much astonished to read in the newspapers that Professor Brown declared here the possibility that offal, which would supply food for the poor, might come from Vienna and Hamburg packed in ice. I inquired what was sent from Vienna, and I found that it was salted intestines. I do not think that that will be of very great value here as food for the poor.

2476. What you would tell the Committee is that, looking to Professor Brown's statement, you do not believe that it is entirely borne out by what really takes place as to the export of offal from Vienna?—Offal fit to be eaten by the poor could not be sent.

2477. Some offal does come, but you say that it is not that which goes into the market for consumption?—Quite so; in Russia, near our boundaries, cattle are very cheap; and nothing would seem to be more easy than to have a great slaughtering-house close to our boundaries, and have all these Russian cattle which are not allowed to come in, slaughtered at the boundaries, and sent to Berlin in ice; nothing seemed more plain and clear; but after examining the thing it proved to be impossible.

2478. You state that it has been tried with regard to your home consumption, and has not been adopted from its not proving successful?—In Prussia it has not been tried, but it has been much spoken about. I am told that in Austria it has been tried and failed, and that the result has been bankruptcy; but in Berlin I myself, and several other gentlemen, spoke very much about it some years ago when the meat was so very dear, and consulted as to whether we could not bring the meat of these prohibited Russian cattle in ice to Berlin; but every reasonable man in Berlin said, "It is not possible, you would lose an immense deal of money."

2479. But you have not tried it in Prussia?—We have not tried it in Prussia.

2480. You stated, I think, that it had been tried in Austria?—I am told that it has been tried in Austria; but I cannot speak from knowledge as to that.

2481. Are the farmers in Germany satisfied with the existing regulations of your Government as against cattle plague?—I do not know how it is here, but I daresay farmers are seldom quite satisfied with Government measures. In this case they were. When one looks along the boundaries from Tilsit and Memel down to Cracow and Upper Silesia, I have a notion that that is more than 1,000 English miles of boundary to be protected, and we had the conviction that our Government did all that they could honestly do. It paid the whole value of the slaughtered cattle in every case where the rinderpest broke out, and it sent also the best man, the president

Chairman—continued.

president of the province, like a Roman dictator to the spot, and the disease was stamped out. In 1873, when the cattle plague broke out in Upper Silesia, which is a very difficult country to deal with because it is inhabited by 100,000 small farmers near the boundaries, every one of whom has his cow, it was rather a difficult case; but in 10 days all had been stamped out, and nothing more went over the boundaries of that country.

2482. From the evidence that was given us by Professor Müller the other day, it appears that the German Government are intending to make their restrictions more severe?—They are. I hope that the whole of Europe will have learned very much from this last case, and I hope we shall all learn together. From what Professor Brown said before this Committee, I think that every country has something to learn by what has happened.

2483. Are you aware of the measures that are proposed to be taken?—I know them perfectly well. I shall do my best in the German Parliament to make them still more severe; and, if I shall not be trespassing too far upon your kind indulgence, I will take the liberty of saying what I have dreamed might be done by England, because I am decidedly of opinion that the great work to be done is to provide additional securities, and it must be done *viribus unitis*; there must be a *union indivisible* between Germany, England, Holland, France, and Belgium, because in this matter you cannot separate the interest of one country from that of another; you cannot put it as a cattle question and a sheep question, and I do not know what other question, but it is all a *union indivisible*; if you prohibit the cattle and allow the sheep, the sheep may bring you the disease, and if you prohibit the sheep, the goats and other ruminant animals may bring it to you.

2484. Then what you would say to the Committee is, that you look for the suppression of these diseases throughout the countries generally of Europe, to restrictive measures rather than to prohibitive measures as against the import?—I would first beg permission to say that we have ourselves a very great interest in stamping it out everywhere. It is not only for our foreign trade, but it is of the first importance to ourselves that we should do our very best, and that we should examine now how measures can be made more severe still. For instance, it is already fixed with us that within about 50 English miles from the dangerous boundaries of Russia no head of cattle may come to a railway station in order to be transported.

2485. Are you quite positive about the 50 miles, because Professor Müller stated in his evidence that it was a zone of about 25 miles in width?—Professor Müller is wrong then. We have first a very stringent rule, that only beyond 10 German miles, or 50 English miles, from the menaced boundary, the cattle may be brought to the station. But we have something more. Professor Müller probably intended to say that five German miles, that is to say 25 English miles, from the boundaries no cattle are allowed to leave their stables without permission.

2486. He stated that the zone applied to a district in which the cattle were all registered, and could only be moved by permission from the head man of the district?—So it is.

2487. And that no cattle were allowed to be placed upon a railway truck, excepting at certain points which were in the interior of the zone?—Yes, with the certificate not of a veterinarian but of the sheriff of the county, and under the inspection of a veterinarian at the station itself.

2488. That applies to the whole of your Prussian boundary proper, does it not?—Whenever danger might be possible.

2489. Does it exist with regard to the Austrian frontier?—I do not think. If you look at the map, Prussia is more interested in Russia than in Austria in this respect.

2490. Will you tell the Committee, first, if you please, what you think that your own country ought to do for your own protection and in your own interest?—The Government did all that was possible to awaken general attention upon the subject; and I consider it a very great advantage that public attention has been called to it in England, because we must study this affair altogether; we must endeavour in every possible way to protect the farmer, not by impossible prohibitions but by possible ways, as I told you. Within 50 miles from the boundaries the cattle are not allowed to come to the railways; and within 25 miles no cow out of a village or a farm can be moved without permission. I am glad to say that every county with us has a royal veterinarian fixed in it; but besides that, we have what I may call flying veterinarians, or travelling inspectors having no fixed post of duty, but who are obliged to go day and night through the whole country. Then we have given the order that on the occurrence of the first doubtful case (what happened this time shall not happen again, that is to say, that the disease reached you before you had been warned by us); every county authority will be directed to despatch the intelligence of an outbreak of disease immediately to England.

2491. You propose now that the man who first sees the outbreak shall telegraph instead of waiting for the department to telegraph on information received from the local authority?—So it is. It will not go through the different departments but directly, as soon as possible. Then another great measure that is proposed now is that we have made, I may say, something like a mobilising plan. The county authorities order that as soon as any suspicious case happens, no cattle in the whole district may be brought back from a market, but that they must be slaughtered there.

2492. We understood Professor Müller to say that for the future, on the first outbreak of cattle plague, the market at Hamburg, the market at Breslau, the market at Berlin, and the market at Dresden, would all be closed; will that be so?—I daresay that will be so. I do not say that it will be so with regard to Baden and Wurtemberg, which are not on the road for export; but this is quite a new regulation, and that would be a matter to be arranged betwixt your Government and ours. If you desire to have shut up still more markets, perhaps that might be done; but I know that it can only happen near the Russian boundary, and all markets for some hundreds of miles along the boundary will be arranged in such a way that no cattle can be brought alive from the market.

2493. And therefore there will be the protection of telegraphic communication the moment that the disease breaks out, and also that almost

Baron *Fr. von Behr.*

8 June 1877.

Baron *Fr. von Behr.*

8 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

at the same moment the export will be stopped, because the markets will be closed?—That will be so. That I call the mobilising plan, because it does not require any large conferences, but it is done immediately. Local authorities will have a right to do it without asking the permission of the Ministry.

2494. That would not only be a protection for yourselves, but you represent that it would be a protection for England and other countries?—The only difference that I can see betwixt England and the other countries is, that you are in a much better position than every other neighbour of ours. You have three points from which cattle come to you out of Germany. France has, I do not know how many dozen railway lines, Belgium equally, Holland equally, and Switzerland equally; England is in by far the best position.

2495. Do you represent that the cattle plague is stamped out in Germany at the present moment?—I am quite convinced of it, and I may state that all our neighbours, with the exception of England, are of that conviction, and have reopened their boundaries. I was very much astonished to read yesterday in the "Times" that the Dutch Consul said here that Holland did not open her boundaries. He may be right as he is an official man, but I doubt it, and if I find, when I return home, that he is wrong, I shall take the liberty of writing from Berlin about it. I think that there may be a mistake. We have something like a little pleuro-pneumonia war with Holland, and I think it will depend upon that. All our other neighbours opened their boundaries.

12496. What I understood Mr. May, the Consul General of the Netherlands, to state was, that they had prohibited the introduction of cattle since 1872?—Yes, I daresay that is what I call the pleuro-pneumonia war.

2497. And that at present, although they allowed sheep that were in transit to go through their country, they did not admit of any cattle being introduced into it?—That speaks for me. Those measures in Holland have not been taken on account of the cattle plague, but have been in practice for years past, and the reason of that is probably what I told you, viz., the pleuro-pneumonia war.

2498. Will you state what further measures, besides those which we have been told of, you think right to be taken, both for your own protection and for the protection of your export trade?—What I have to state is an old claim of mine. I have studied this affair since the Vienna International Congress, five years ago.

2499. That was the conference at which it was attempted, was it not, to bring about an arrangement by which telegraphic communication of these outbreaks was to be made?—The conference agreed to a great number of different proposals, but I am sorry to state that very little has been done yet, not by the fault of Germany, but, to tell the truth, it is for the greatest part on account of Russia, which did not protect us against cattle plague. Since that time I have endeavoured in my country to obtain more severe measures. I am of opinion that if the punishment is not sufficiently severe to frighten the smugglers, it will have no influence.

2500. Your punishment is tolerably severe now, is it not?—It is not severe enough for me; I would have it much more severe.

Chairman—continued.

2501. Professor Müller stated that, in case the smugglers refused to answer the challenge of the sentry they were shot, and that if taken, they were imprisoned for three years?—If he told such an anecdote as that about a person being shot, I must give the correct version of it. There was a village in which the cattle plague existed, and it was forbidden to come out of it, a poor man came out, and the soldier called on him, and he did not answer, then the soldier shot at him, and he was killed; but afterwards it was discovered that the poor fellow was a deaf-mute.

2502. But, if that is the case, you have already very strong measures taken?—I wish much stronger measures to be taken, because as long as smugglers bring an animal over by night for gaining a few dollars, what misfortunes can they bring over the whole of Europe! Philosophers may think otherwise about that; but I, as a practical man, think it should be an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth about it. If a man to gain a few dollars brings such an immense danger on the country he must be punished very severely. I find that it is forbidden in your clubs to give any money to the servants, because they are to do their duty without extra paying; we have the same theory on our boundaries; so we say that the policemen must do their duty likewise without gratification. But I am of the contrary opinion, I would pay those who denounce a smuggler a good deal of money. If a man brings an animal over the boundary against the law, and gains by it 10 dollars, his neighbour will denounce him if he is sure to win 20 dollars by denouncing him. I shall do my very best to have the smugglers punished in every way.

2503. Do you think that your country would probably strengthen the already strong measures that are taken against the smuggling of cattle?—I do not know what influence the farmers have in England, but we farmers have some influence in our Parliament; we shall do our best, because if England prohibits the import for half a year or more it will cost us a good deal of money, and, perhaps, all because such a man has brought over a cow by night. I think Professor Müller is wrong about the three years' imprisonment; as much as I know, law says: that him who "knowingly" smuggles will be punished by prison up to one year. If, in consequence of his smuggling, other cattle get diseased, imprisonment takes place from one month to two years.

2504. The word "knowingly," then, is in the law of Germany as well as in that of England?—Yes.

2505. Are there any other restrictions that you might enforce?—I should wish that Prince Bismark himself, the Chancellor, should issue the instructions about the cattle plague measures; I wish that they should be given by the highest authority of the empire, in order to show the lowest employés that there is no joke about it, and that in carrying out a measure of such immense importance they must all do their very best.

2506. Would you make those instructions applicable to the whole German Empire, and therefore to the whole cattle disease importing frontier, or would they be only applicable to Prussia?—All measures concerning the cattle plague are not under the law of Prussia, but under the law of the empire.

2507. That is what I asked before with regard to

Chairman—continued.

to the zone or boundary of the district; whether that applied as an imperial instruction to the whole empire?—Not yet; that is in Prussia; other German States have not boundaries towards Russia.

2508. But do not a great number of cattle come over the Austrian frontier that are equally liable to bring in cattle plague?—I do not interest myself in those measures as to Austria; but, so far as I know, there are very severe restrictions also there; I believe they must prove that the cattle have been a certain number of days in Austria, but it is very different in Austria; Bohemia is very strict about it, but some other provinces are, perhaps, not so strict.

2509. Of course the danger to England is a danger existing from the importation of cattle generally from Germany, and not only from Prussia; and, therefore, if the restrictions made by Prussia to protect England are not adopted by Austria, we are still liable to danger from that country?—It could not pass through Germany; if it could come by the Adriatic it might get to England from Austria.

2510. But I mean from these grey and other cattle which are supposed to be liable to the infection?—I am not so specially instructed about Austrian things; but I say that, as we have all the very same interest to provide additional securities, if the English Government would say to Germany, "Now we desire you to do this, and this, and this, and this, and this," we should, of course, most willingly do it.

2511. You think that any reasonable regulations guaranteeing England with regard to your frontier would be willingly adopted by Germany?—Yes. As I have already said, this thing is not to be dealt with in the interest of one country alone, but all those countries are in one *union indivisible*.

2512. Will you state to the Committee in what way you think we can strengthen your hands by our regulations?—With the greatest pleasure. This, to tell the whole truth, rather gave me more desire to appear here before this Committee. Take this dreadful case in Hamburg, which brought over to you the cattle plague; why could you not set an Englishman by the side of the Hamburgian or Prussian veterinarian? How many ports in Germany export cattle to England?—There are only Tonning and Hamburg and Gestermunde, and perhaps one or two others.

2513. What you mean to represent is that England ought to maintain at the different export places a veterinary staff, so as to satisfy themselves by inspection there that the cattle were free from disease before they came over?—Yes; but between nations like us the veterinarian could have no veto; he could not say "I do not allow these cattle to be sent," but he could say to his German fellow-veterinarian: "My dear friend, if you bring those cattle to the ship, I will telegraph immediately to England, and when they arrive there they will not let them in." What would it cost you?—If you gave such a man, in each of the three ports, about 300 *l.* a year, he could inspect every ship, and give you every security that you want to have; but, of course, he could not prohibit the embarkation.

2514. Do you think that the examination by a veterinary inspector at the port of embarkation would be an absolute protection to this country?—I think it is not possible to doubt that it would greatly augment your security if there is an English veterinarian looking after every ship and examining every head of cattle.

2515. In the case of the last outbreak of the cattle plague, which was introduced here from Altona or from Hamburg, the cattle were inspected before they started by a veterinary officer at Hamburg, and they came over here being declared not to have the cattle plague; they started, and yet, when they arrived here, one of them died as it was being landed, from the plague having broken out on the voyage; in that case the veterinary inspection was no protection?—That case was a very grave one. I am glad that I was not a juror to judge the veterinary who inspected the cattle. Either he did not inspect them, or it was impossible to see the disease; but in any case, if your Government had a man there, who, of course, would be a person in whom your Government had entire confidence, because you would not send another man, you would be convinced that nothing more could be done.

2516. That, at all events, you represent would be great additional protection?—I think that it must be.

2517. Is that the only suggestion that you would make with regard to England?—My general feeling is that not only England, but France, and Belgium, and Holland, and Switzerland are all in the same danger, and that we must all do our very best to discover what securities we can make out to protect ourselves against this dreadful disease. Perhaps England might ask us that the law as to the cleansing of the ships should be an imperial law with us; until now it has not been an imperial law, but it is the law of Hamburg, and Oldenburg, and Prussia.

2518. You would make the law of disinfecting ships a general imperial law applicable to all the country?—Yes.

2519. That is what you would recommend with regard to cattle plague?—Yes.

2520. Have you much pleuro-pneumonia in your country?—I hope not so much as you have.

2521. But still pleuro-pneumonia exists in Germany, does it not?—Yes.

2522. Do you consider that to be nearly as dangerous a disease as cattle plague?—By no means; there is nothing like cattle plague.

2523. Do you slaughter the animals in the case of pleuro-pneumonia?—We have new laws about that; and I am convinced that my country would be most willing to enter into any arrangement with regard to that which may be proposed. You, probably, know better than I do that Switzerland proposed an international arrangement against pleuro-pneumonia; and I think it most likely that, after this great outbreak of cattle plague, and this great fright to Europe, all countries will be more ready still to enter into that idea of Switzerland.

2524. The malady of pleuro-pneumonia remains for a very long time in the animal before it is discovered, does it not?—It does.

2525. Therefore the inspection, although it may be good as far as cattle plague is concerned, is not very protective as against pleuro-pneumonia?—Yes; but we would do, at least, what we can do.

2526. But if we proposed to deal with pleuro-

Baron *Fr. von Behr.*
8 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

pneumonia with a view to stamping it out in England, you would have to consider not only the cattle plague regulations of Germany, but their pleuro-pneumonia regulations also?—Yes.

2527. Do you adopt measures with regard to pleuro-pneumonia in Germany with a view of stamping it out?—Yes; for we pay regularly for every case.

2528. Do you believe that you are gradually getting rid of pleuro-pneumonia out of the country?—This law has only existed for about a year; but I have the notion that if farmers get regularly paid for their diseased animals they have no reason to hide the disease; and if there is no reason to hide it, it will be stamped out. But many professors have different views; some pretend that an animal can live for years with a slight pleuro-pneumonia in the body.

2529. With the seeds of the disease in the animal?—Yes. If the animal is highly fed, then the disease comes out very quickly, but not otherwise.

2530. I believe Professor Müller stated that, with regard to the other infectious disease, viz., foot-and-mouth disease, you almost always have it in Germany?—I see in the official report of your Veterinary Department something about that. I was sorry to read that I do not know how many thousand sheep which came over from Hamburg were written down as being ill, but I understand that that was not the real foot-and-mouth disease. I have been told that Mr. Booth has been saying in this Committee that the foot-and-mouth disease was so very dangerous, that he lost, I do not know how many highly-prized shorthorns from it. That must be quite a different disease from the one which we have, because with us it is generally so very little dangerous that we do not care about it. I have had many times the foot-and-mouth disease among my cattle, but I have never lost one cow with it.

2531. Therefore you do not look upon foot-and-mouth disease with the same alarm as you do upon the other diseases?—Not a bit. If our herds are suffering from it, all that we do is to give them a little meal and water instead of fodder; by high feeding it may be more dangerously developed, but I am not aware of it.

2532. We understood Professor Müller to say that it is almost impossible to get rid of foot-and-mouth disease in Germany from the fact of its being constantly brought across from your frontier by the swine from Hungaria?—I am not informed about that.

2533. So that in what you state to the Committee to-day you wish to deal principally with the cattle plague?—We farmers in Germany only think of cattle plague, because that is a dreadful plague for us altogether; all other diseases are like children's illnesses compared with that.

2534. And you represent the feeling of the farmers in Germany as being very strong in favour of the continuance of the export trade from that country, protecting both Germany and the countries to which you export by more severe regulations?—I may take the liberty of expressing the wish of my colleagues the German farmers, that England, being the last of all our neighbours who until now has had her boundaries closed against us, will open them as soon as possible, as all our other neighbours have done.

2535. Is there anything else that you would wish to put before the Committee?—I have only to apologise for any errors that I may have committed.

Chairman—continued.

Mr. *W. E. Forster.*

2536. You are yourself a large cattle owner are you not?—Yes, if you call it large; I do not know what you call large.

2537. Are you one of those German gentlemen who buy costly cattle?—I had once a good some English shorthorns, and Lincoln rams, and so on; many English rams come over with foot disease, but we do not care for these things. We buy a great many English cattle every year.

2538. Notwithstanding that you give what are considered in Germany large prices for shorthorned cattle, you are not much impressed with the danger of the foot-and-mouth disease?—Not at all.

2539. You have an Agricultural Society in Germany, have you not?—Yes; that society has sent me over to give evidence before this Committee.

2540. Is that a society for all Prussia, or for Pomerania only?—That is for all Germany; all over Germany there is not a country which has not a little agricultural society. These little provincial societies combine, and they elect members for the provinces, and the heads of those provincial societies elect members for the central society; that central body is the Deutscher Landwirthschaftsrath; and having read in the journal called the "Field" the evidence that has been given before you, for instance by a Danish farmer, the German farmers immediately sent me over as a witness.

2541. What is the distance of your own estate from the Russian frontier?—I am happy to state that it is very far.

Mr. *Assheton.*

2542. I suppose you do not like having the foot-and-mouth disease in your stock?—I do not like it, but I do not care much about it; we cannot prevent it; it comes and it goes, and it does not matter.

2543. Have you ever at all estimated in your own mind what value it takes out of a beast; how much less in value a beast was from having foot-and-mouth disease?—I have had it several times in my herds, and three or four fat cows were so ill that they could not eat; then they got the meal and the water, and I did not give my children the fresh milk, but I cooked it; then after a week or so all was forgotten. It may be that here, where there is high feeding, and it may be that in parts of Saxony where they have high feeding too, that illness is dangerous; but with us, where we have healthy cattle going over the fields the whole summer, the disease comes and goes, and we do not mind it.

2544. Do you not think that it injures a fat cow to have the foot-and-mouth disease?—Yes; it may be so with high feeding, but my herd have never been so fat as to suffer earnestly from it.

2545. Do you, as a farmer, complain of these regulations with regard to cattle plague?—We think that, if necessary, we ought to submit to them. The officials, who are like despots, are sent to stamp it out, and we obey them because we know that we must obey.

2546. You told us about all these regulations respecting Russian and Austrian cattle; should you, as a farmer, like to see those regulations done

Mr. *Assheton*—continued.

done away with?—Not the least in the world. Do not think that we do all this for you, else it would be badly done. We do it for ourselves; egotism is the first principle in life, I am afraid to state.

Mr. *Wilbraham Egerton.*

2547. Do you think you can persuade your Government to carry out the suggestions which you have made in order to prevent cattle plague from being introduced into your country?—I think that by carrying out the two suggestions tat I have made, of severer punishments and extra pay for these detectives, we may put down smuggling, and I hope that we shall do it. For some years to come they will be so frightened that they will take care not to smuggle.

2548. As I understand you, you will not do that in order to do us any good, but you will do it for your own protection?—Yes.

2549. Then why have you not done it before?—Until now we were entitled to believe that our laws were sufficient. In the year 1873, we had an outbreak and it was stamped out immediately.

2550. But you have been always subject to the importation of cattle plague from Russia, and you are aware that cattle plague is a very great danger to your animals; why are you likely to do it now, when you have not done it for years past?—If no mischief occurs, then you might think that the rules are answering; but if such a case happens as happened now, and we see that the law is not sufficient, then it is time to mend it. We do not mend it if it is not necessary.

2551. Then your point is, that your farmers, acting upon the Government, will make their alarm at the introduction of the cattle plague felt by the Government now, although they have not done it before?—It has not hurt us until now.

2552. You suggest that an English veterinary surgeon should be appointed at the ports; is that for your benefit, to enable your exporters to send their animals in a sound state to England?—My opinion is, that we shall most willingly do all that our neighbours desire us to do, to give them the certainty of being well protected. If, to-morrow, Switzerland were to come to us and say, "Could you not do this?" and Belgium and Holland were to say, "Could you not do that" I think we should, with the greatest sincerity, do our utmost to do it. England is in such a happy position that there are only half-a-dozen ports from which cattle can be brought over; and I have a notion that what I propose would give you the idea of great security.

2553. But that would be transferring to us the responsibility of the importation of the disease into England?—Not at all, because the same German veterinarian must be there, and must inspect the cattle as until now, and your countryman would have no right at all except to say to the German veterinarian: "My dear fellow, take care." That is all that he could do; but I think that it would give you security to know there is a man of your country who knows that his country has an enormous fear of the disease, and that he must do his very best to detect it.

2554. You think that your Government would be willing to have an English veterinary officer at the German ports?—I think they would not object. If the Texan disease came over to England that the newspapers speak so much of, would

Mr. *Wilbraham Egerton*—continued.

you think it against your honour and dignity if a German veterinarian stood in an English port to look at the cattle without any right to order, but only to inspect?

2555. I rather misunderstood you. I thought you would give the English veterinary surgeon some power?—No, I stated that he should have no power.

Mr. *Elliot.*

2556. Did I correctly understand you to say that the best cattle in Germany are chosen to be sent to England, and that the inferior ones go to France and elsewhere?—The best sheep.

2557. Not the best cattle?—I do not feel myself quite informed, but I dare say it is the case. If I fatten my wethers and sheep, and sell them to the man, then the man who buys them makes this calculation for himself: "I can give, say, 30*s.* a head, because I know a good many of them I can sell for 50*s.* in England." You pay here in clubs and houses 10*d.* a pound for your meat. That is such an enormous price, that it is worth the trouble to bring over the very best cattle. If among my 100 cattle some are sold at a high price, that gives a better average price.

2558. You said, I think, that the farmers in Germany would feel very much the stoppage of the exportation of live cattle?—Yes, very much. If such a quantity of cattle is not brought to England, and does not fetch these high prices, of course it brings down the whole price.

2559. Are you aware that the farmers in England are now very much hampered, and put to very great expense by the importation of cattle plague by means of German cattle?—I am of opinion, that when they get paid regularly, for slaughtered cattle they do not suffer more than we do. Your cattle is dearer, but your purse is much longer.

2560. You are aware that the cattle plague was introduced into England from Germany?—Do not be too severe upon my country. Germany does not breed cattle plague; it comes from Russia, and we have the very expensive and difficult mission to protect the whole of Europe against cattle plague from Russia.

2561. The last outbreak of rinderpest in this country came from Hamburg, did it not?—So the newspapers say.

2562. I suppose you agree with me that we ought to look after our own interest in this country?—Certainly, just as we shall do.

Mr. *John Holmes.*

2563. I think you stated that you do not care very much about pleuro-pneumonia or foot-and-mouth disease, but that you regard them as children's diseases?—Pleuro-pneumonia is a dreadful disease; but I say that I do not know how to stamp it out.

2564. But you regard the cattle plague as the important disease, and so important, that you, in your country, always stamp it out?—Yes, as soon as possible.

2565. If you would stamp it out, I suppose you would not allow cattle suffering from it to reach any port?—No.

2566. If that be so, what additional safeguard will it be to us, as a country, to have the advantage, which you kindly say we might have, of having an English veterinary surgeon at each of those ports?—Because errors are possible all through

Baron *Fr. von Behr.*

8 June 1877.

Mr. *John Holmes*—continued.

life; two veterinarians are better than one, and four eyes are better than two to look for the right.

2567. But if you protect yourselves by stamping out the disease, and not allowing cattle to come to ports, and then have your own inspectors at the ports, it would appear to me that upon the whole we run very little risk now of importing cattle plague from your country?—My meaning was to give yourselves the persuasion that everything was being done that one might fancy necessary to protect you against this dreadful disease; and I thought it would give you more confidence if not only a Prussian, or a Hamburgian veterinarian stood there, but by the side of him an English one.

2568. You think that it would be an advantage?—It would be an advantage for you, not for us.

Mr. *Anderson.*

2569. Do you consider that pleuro-pneumonia is a disease which has been imported into Germany, or that it is is indigenous?—That is a difficult thing to answer; I think that if you asked 12 professors, six would say one thing, and six would say another.

2570. Do you consider that foot-and-mouth disease is an imported or an indigenous disease in Germany?—I did not study the question. A friend of mine, Mr. Witte, who has been sent over with me, knows that better than I do. We have some slight foot disease which our sheep get when they have wet feet for weeks.

2571. That is what we call rot?—I daresay; Yes.

2572. You spoke of your cows having foot-and-mouth disease, and you said that you did not give the milk to your children then; do the cows lose their milk then?—During those days when they do not eat they give little milk.

2573. But does the milk come back to them afterwards?—Yes; it is just like a cold wind that comes over a flock for a week or so. We do not care for foot-and-mouth disease. Pleuro-pneumonia is a dreadful disease; but until now we have not known how to get rid of it entirely because it is in every country; it is in Holland, in England, and in some parts of Germany.

2574. When suffering from foot-and-mouth disease, do the cows ever cast their calves?—All that, again, I daresay, happens more with highly-fed cattle, and not so much with ours; but this again is a question which my countryman, Mr. Witte, who has a large shorthorn herd, would be able to answer. He has for a many years bought shorthorns, and feeds them highly, and he will know that.

2575. You spoke about the impossibility of importing dead meat into this country on account of the price; can you tell us what is the average price of dead meat in Germany?—That is a very difficult question to answer. It depends upon the quality; it depends upon who buys the meat, and it depends upon the time of the year.

2576. You cannot give even an average?—Generally speaking, the butcher is paid seven pence for the best pieces per pound.

2577. That is the retail price, but I want the wholesale price?—That is difficult to give, because the variation it very great. In the sugar fabrics they have high feeding, and there it is dear.

Colonel *Kingscote.*

2578. May I ask you whether you breed your cattle, or whether you buy them?—We buy some from Schleswig-Holstein, some we breed ourselves, and some we buy in England.

2579. Can you import either cattle or sheep from England at the present time?—I think we should rather protect ourselves, because you have much more disease now than we have; but I do not know whether we can import now.

2580. It is prohibited, is it not?—I really cannot remember.

2581. If there was a total prohibition which lasted for some time, it would be a great loss to you, would it not?—It would be rather a loss to us.

2582. Because you would not be able to get some of your best animals over?—That is so.

2583. You think that crossing with English stock improves the breed of your cattle in Germany?—No doubt.

2584. You think they will produce more meat when crossed with our cattle, and therefore you would consider it a loss to your country if the importation of English cattle to Germany was stopped for a long period?—Yes, it would be a loss, but not a tenth part of the loss that we should have if export to England were forbidden.

2585. With regard to foot-and-mouth disease, are you not aware that foot-and-mouth disease attacks cattle that are poor almost worse than it does those that are fat?—I have a notion that it acts more hardly upon highly-fed cattle than upon poorly living ones.

2586. Have you never lost any calves by it?—I cannot remember; but the disease is not so bad with us, though here it may be much heavier.

2587. You repeat that you do not think much of it?—We do not.

Mr. *Arthur Peel.*

2588. Would there be any difficulty in the way of procuring ice, in introducing a dead-meat trade from Germany?—Our winters are cold enough, and we could collect ice; but it would not pay to transport the meat in ice; and ice is not the only thing that would be requisite.

2589. Would it be possible to send a whole beast over, offal and all, in ice?—It would be quite impossible to pack the carcase in ice in such a way as to preserve the meat and keep it fit for eating. If it had been possible, why should we not have done it before, to avoid that great loss which we had to incur by having to kill and sell at the market at Deptford? We lost 2 *l.* upon every beast.

2590. But the trade is only a new trade, and you have not gained experience yet in the dead-meat trade; are you aware that there is an experiment now being tried to introduce dead meat from Vienna to this country?—I do not know it; but I am sure that it will not pay.

2591. You do not agree with the Prussian gentleman, who was a Professor of the Veterinary College, that no matter what precautions you take in Germany, it would still be necessary to slaughter cattle at our port at Deptford?—I hope that the time will come when you yourselves will be persuaded that all is regulated so well that you can classify German cattle in the same schedule as French cattle and Spanish cattle.

Now

Mr. *Arthur Peel*—continued.

Now you class them with the Russian cattle; and I think that we should rather prefer to be classified with the Spanish and French.

Chairman.

2592. Germany is not at present classified as Russia is; at this moment, in consequence of the outbreak of cattle plague, cattle are prohibited; but it is not generally classified as Russia is?—Not in general; it was at the time when Mr. Williams made these declarations at Vienna.

Mr. *Arthur Peel.*

2593. You have made a very valuable suggestion about allowing English veterinary inspectors to reside at the German ports of departure; I suppose to give that gentleman's opinion any value he must have the cattle under his inspection for a certain number of days, and there must be a sort of quarantine established?—Whether it would be possible to keep them some days there I do not know, but I am very dubious about it; all I intended to say was, that when the German veterinarian stands there and inspects the cattle, it would give you a good deal of security to know that by the side of him is an Englishman who owes it to his country to do his very best to protect it and to give you the earliest intelligence of disease.

2594. He could not detect disease which was incubating in the animal, and therefore he would require to have the animal under his view for some days; do you think that that would be practicable?—I do not know; I should think that that depends upon how the ships go, and so on; I do not know whether the trade would admit of it, but I doubt it strongly.

2595. Do you think that the system of compensation which is adopted in Germany is sufficient to bring about the detection of disease?—Yes. In Germany, if a farmer has his cattle slaughtered, and if he gets paid, who pays it? The empire. I think that it would be wiser if only, let us say, a half of it, were paid by the empire and the other half by the province.

2596. Have you, in Germany, the practice which the Consul General for the Netherlands stated prevailed in his country, that where an animal is suspected of disease, and the owner of it declares it to the authority, the full value is paid; and that where a diseased animal only is notified, then only half the value is paid?—I think that that must be with regard to pleuro-pneumonia; for cattle plague they pay the whole.

2597. But you do not think that it would be a good plan to put a premium upon having suspected animals rather than diseased animals notified to the authorities. If you have the full value paid for a suspected animal, there would be an additional inducement to the owner of the animal to declare that the beast was diseased, would there not?—Surely it is a good principle never to ask anybody anything which is against his own interest, but you may ask him as much as you please, if you pay well for the truth.

Mr. *Chaplin.*

2598. I think I understand that you do not consider your present precautions on the frontier sufficient to guard you against the risk of cattle plague being imported by means of smuggling?—I took the liberty of stating that our foreign precautions already have been made much stricter, for instance:—No cow will be allowed to be removed from the owner's premises within 25 miles from the boundaries, or to be taken on a railway within 50 miles from the boundaries; but I think that more severe punishments might be inflicted in the event of the law being broken by smugglers.

Mr. *Chaplin*—continued.

2599. Supposing that you had all the precautions which you yourself desire, would that, in your opinion, make you absolutely safe against the risk of the importation of disease?—If you look at the boundaries you will see that they extend for more than 1,000 miles, and we do our very best for you and for ourselves; but who can say that it would not be possible for a man on a dark night to bring some heads of cattle across the boundary? If you look at that immense distance, you will see how difficult it is to protect the boundary. I proudly pretend that no other nation when in our geographical situation would be a better safeguard for Europe.

2600. You must always run some risk, whatever precautions you take?—Certainly.

2601. Consequently, if we were to import live cattle from Germany, we must run a share of the risk to which you are yourselves subject?—A very small share; the smallest share of all, because you have the sea all round you, and you have only three or four ports from which cattle are shipped to England, and you can protect yourselves by having a veterinarian in our ports, and also by having a veterinarian in your ports here. As I have told you, all our neighbours have removed the restriction which they thought themselves obliged to impose upon us when the outbreak came, except one country, and that was Switzerland. Why did not Switzerland take away the restrictions? Because it had taken none. And why had it taken none? When our Government wrote to Switzerland, saying, "Will you not take precautions? we have the rinderpest"; Switzerland answered us, "We know that Germany will do its very best, and that it will do so well that we need take no precautions at our boundaries." They have some dozen railways which can bring the cattle in from Germany to Switzerland, and you have only a few seaports, which you can easily protect. No country can protect itself so well as England can.

Chairman.

2602. Was that in 1873?—No, quite lately. That gave us satisfaction, and so I took the liberty of telling that little story here.

2603. The Committee are very much obliged to you for your interesting and valuable evidence?—I thank the Committee for hearing my evidence, and I only desire further to say that the German farmers wish for nothing better than to act with your farmers, and *viribus unitis*, to conquer this frightful disease.

Mr. Charles Lennox Peel, called in; and Examined.

Mr. *Peel.*

8 June 1877.

Chairman.

2604. You are the Clerk of the Council?—I am.

2604.* I believe that you are prepared to put in, on the part of the Privy Council, the orders of the Council since the outbreak of cattle plague this year?—Yes. (*The same were delivered in.*)

2605. Do you put in also a return of the local authorities who have made regulations under the permissive Order of the 13th February 1877?—Yes; 36 counties and 29 boroughs. (*The same was delivered in.*)

2606. Do you also put in a list of the local authorities who have made regulations against foot-and-mouth disease under the Order of the 5th of June 1876?—Yes; 42 counties in England and Wales, 20 in Scotland, 33 boroughs in England and Wales, and 5 burghs in Scotland. (*The same was delivered in.*)

2607. Those are all the papers which you are at present able to place before the Committee?—These are all that I can put in to-day. I shall be able to furnish the Committee with an analysis of some other papers.

Mr. *W. E. Forster.*

2608. Will you be able, in making that analysis, to draw a distinction between those counties that have stopped the markets and those that have merely prohibited the movement?—Yes; I have instructed a table to be prepared showing those that have altogether prohibited movement, those that have prohibited it except with license, and those that have prohibited or interfered with fairs and markets.

2609. Would you be good enough to put in a specimen order of each of those?—Yes.

2610. A similar Order to that was not issued by the Privy Council in 1873, I believe?—I think not; it was issued this year because we thought there might be a sudden outbreak, as it was beginning to spread, and that it would be better for the local authorities to be able to act at once without referring to us.

2611. The time to which these powers to act extend has not been limited, has it?—It is not limited.

Chairman.

2612. Will you put in the whole of the Orders?—Yes. We passed a very important Order limiting the number of ports at which foreign cattle could be landed, and that shall be included.

Mr. Murillo H. Gillett, called in; and Examined.

Mr. *Gillett.*

Chairman.

2613. I believe that your occupation may be at present described as an American Meat Exporter?—Yes.

2614. Were you formerly a cattle-breeder and feeder in America?—Yes.

2615. In what part of the United States?—Ohio.

2616. What was the length of your experience as a farmer there?—Thirty-one years.

2617. What was the extent of your farm there?—At one time it was 80 acres, and another time it was 1,460 acres, and at another time it was 3,200.

2618. What was the nature of your farming operations there?—It was principally the growing of cattle, sheep, and hogs.

2619. Can you give any details to the Committee of your mode of feeding or dealing with your cattle there?—Yes; we commence with our cattle in the fall, after they are two years old. In the month of October we usually commence feeding them with corn on the grass, and we feed them that winter what we call half-feeding, that is to say, we feed them with corn once a day, and with hay once a day, running on the grass as long as the grass lasts. When the grass gives out we feed them on corn once a day, and on hay twice a day, until the grass comes the next spring. The next spring they go on to the grass, and we carry them on the grass until October again. Then we commence feeding them on the grass, and feed them once a day with corn until the grass begins to weaken from the effects of the frost, and then we increase the feed and get them on to what we call full feed, that is to say, all the corn they will eat during the day. We feed them until the spring, February, March, or

Chairman—continued.

April, and when the market suits we consider the cattle fit for the market. They are then bought by operators in cattle, what we call middle men, or they are shipped by the farmers themselves to the sea-board cities, and sold on our markets there as they are sold on your London markets.

2620. Do you mean by "shipped" sent by railroad?—Yes, sent by railway.

2621. What number of head of cattle do you deal with on your own farm annually?—The number varies. If wool-growing is most profitable, we let down our number of cattle, and increase our flock of sheep; if it pays best to make beef, we let down our flock of sheep and grow more cattle; so that it depends wholly upon the consumption of wool and upon the consumption of beef as to the quantity that I myself produce.

2622. Can you give any average of the number of cattle that you are able to feed off generally on a farm of that size?—Yes, we usually turned off about 700 cattle a year of what we call full-fed cattle.

2623. Was that on the farm of 1,300 acres?—No, that was on the farm of 3,200 acres. On the smaller farm of 1,460 acres we calculated to turn off from 120 to 180 full-fed cattle, carrying at the same time from 1,000 to 1,200 sheep.

2624. Do you feed any swine at the same time?—We always follow our full-fed cattle with a pig to the head. For instance, when we are full-feeding 120 cattle, we should follow them with 120 to 130 hogs. Perhaps I had better explain a little as to how we fatten. We do not fatten in sheds or barns; we fatten out in the fields. We have two fields adjoining; we feed the

Chairman—continued.

the cattle in one field one day, and we take them out in the morning and put them in the other; and we put the hogs in the field where we have taken the cattle from, and the shell-corn and the corn that is not masticated by the cattle is gathered up by the hogs that follow them. Then we move the cattle back the next day, and the hogs follow them in the same way.

2625. So that you are able to keep about one hog per head of cattle on the farm?—Yes.

2626. And what proportion of sheep at the same time?—The sheep are not kept at all with the cattle, but are entirely separate and distinct from the cattle.

2627. Your experience, you say, of farming operations dates from 31 years back?—Yes.

2628. What was the date of the commencement of your new business as an exporter?—August the 2nd 1876; nearly a year ago.

2629. Did you begin largely in the business, or was it only a small trade?—We are not the largest shippers; we commenced on 100 cattle a week, and we have worked up until we are shipping 500 a week, and sometimes a little more.

2630. Do you believe that the trade is developing at all since you began it?—Very much.

2631. How is the business conducted from your first purchase of the cattle to sending the meat over here?—A portion of our cattle are bought in the different States; a large proportion, however, is bought in the city of Chicago, which is 1,000 miles from New York, and they are placed on the railway cars and shipped to New York. We have our own slaughter-houses there, and after our cattle have rested so as to become thoroughly cool, and get all the fever out of them that may have been produced by travelling so long a distance, they are placed in the slaughter-house and slaughtered. We leave them to hang from four to six hours, according to the weather, outside of the refrigerator. At the expiration of those four to six hours they are run into the refrigerator, into a temperature when first opened of probably 55 to 60 degrees; that temperature is gradually worked down until it comes to 37 or 38 degrees. We calculate to keep them in that refrigerator at least two days and nights, from 48 to 50 hours, before the meat goes on board the steamer. The offal from those cattle is thus disposed of; the blood is manufactured into a fertiliser; the hearts and livers are sold for food, being manufactured into what our Germans call the Bologna, and various other things; the bones are all manufactured into bone-dust, which is a very valuable fertiliser, and is used for the northern portions of our States up in the New England States; the tallow or fat is all taken from the entrails whilst the entrails are warm, so far as it can be done; and then the balance is thrown into steam-tanks and manufactured into a fertiliser, so that we utilise every portion of the animal, from the horns to the heels. All the feet are manufactured into glue; they are worth about 40 cents a set; that is about 5*d.* a foot. After the beef is sufficiently refrigerated it is canvassed; that is to say, a cloth is put over it made on purpose, so as to keep it clean in transit. It is then taken and put on board the vessel in a refrigerator which is prepared for the purpose. When it goes aboard the doors are sealed up, the machinery is put to

Chairman—continued.

work carried by the steam of the vessel, and it is brought at a temperature ranging from 36 to 40 degrees, and it is delivered at Liverpool, Bristol, Glasgow, and various ports here, and placed on the market.

2632. You say that you get a large proportion of the cattle from a considerable distance, and from different localities; do you find that the quality of the cattle varies in those different localities?—Yes.

2633. Are you limited to the best quality of cattle in carrying on this trade, or is it possible to treat it all in this way with the same results, so far as the market is concerned, when it arrives there?—We deal with nothing but the better class of cattle; the meat of the ordinary class of cattle, if I quite understand your question, is not the class of meat that it is desirable to bring. We find that our English friends are as fond of good beef, as we are; and ordinary beef is not, I think, well adapted to your market.

2634. Do you find that the quality varies very much in the different States?—Yes.

2635. That limits to a certain extent the supply that you can deal with, does it not?—No, I cannot exactly say that. I think that we have a sufficient supply in the States already furnished with good short-horned cattle to produce all that we may want for the present; and any increased demand that may come upon us from this English trade, if it should increase much more than at present, will be supplied, I have no doubt, as fast as the demand requires it.

2636. Do you mean to say that the supply of the best quality, which I understand is what you wish to get for this particular trade, is so large that the competition for it in the country will still leave a sufficient supply to meet even a larger demand than is now made upon it?—Yes. I think it is simply a matter of dollars and cents; we can give you all you want if you can give us the price for it.

2637. But what has been the range of the present price to be remunerative to the exporter?—Sixpence halfpenny a pound; and at 6½ *d.* a pound it will pay a very good profit.

2638. If that price continues, you believe that the supply will also be maintained on the other side?—I do.

2639. Is that 6½ *d.* per pound in Liverpool?—I mean 6½ *d.* wholesale in the London market; we can take a lesser price in Liverpool.

2640. You have described the treatment of this meat in the vessels; do you consider that the present system of the refrigerating on board ship is all that can be desired, or are there improvements that might be made?—I think that there will be great improvements made. There are constant efforts in that direction now, and I think the fertile brains of some of our Yankees will produce a system that will bring it to better advantage, because cheaper, than we are bringing it now.

2641. At present you bring the meat at this temperature to the ports?—Yes.

2642. After it has arrived in the ports, if your trade in that port is not sufficient for the amount of cargo sent over, you have to take it out of that atmospheric influence in which it has been kept and send it to other markets by rail, have you not?—Yes.

2643. That, I suppose, to a certain extent, prejudices the condition in which it is sent over?

—No,

Mr. *Gillett.*

8 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

—No, I do not know that it does. Any person who is conversant with meat must know that if he take meat out of an atmosphere of 40 degrees, and puts it into a temperature of 50 degrees, or 65 degrees, or 85 degrees, as it was here on Monday, that meat, being colder than the atmosphere, the atmosphere will congeal on the meat and will consequently produce a dampness that will last perhaps for two hours. You let it remain in that same atmosphere for three hours, and that dampness will all disappear, and the meat is very thoroughly chilled from the marrow throughout; so that there is no danger of injury to that meat for any ordinary transit across England.

2644. You believe that it would bear the ordinary transit after it was taken out of the chamber?—Yes.

2645. For what time do you imagine it would remain exposed to the atmosphere after it was removed from the chamber, before any deterioration of the meat took place?—I made a test in September last year in Liverpool. I took meat out of the chamber at four o'clock in the afternoon on Tuesday; I got a butcher of the name of Baker at Birkenhead to hang that meat up; he was afraid that it would not keep, and I told him to take that quarter and hang it up; that I was going to London, and that I was going to be back on Saturday afternoon; that if the meat was good when I came back it was his, and he could pay for it; and that if it was not good, it was already mine, and I had paid for it. I went to his shop on the Saturday at seven o'clock, and he had cut the meat, and he had sent out a joint to a customer to roast for the Sunday, and the meat was in as fine condition as when it came out of the box. That was from Tuesday to Saturday in September; a very muggy spell of weather, too, it was. He killed some meat on the Friday, and hung it up in his shop, and when I got there on the Saturday some of his meat was off, and mine had hung there from the Tuesday.

2646. You state that, I suppose, to show that the way in which the meat keeps depends very much upon the condition in which the animal is killed?—No; I mean to say that it is the preparation entirely. I do not mean to say that a Yankee bullock will stand more heat than an English bullock.

2647. What I meant was that, whereas you take certain precautions before you kill your meat, and then submit it to an atmospheric influence which has a tendency to preserve it, it is in a better condition to stand the exposure than the meat of an animal which has, perhaps, been driven fresh into the town, been killed under the same conditions, and which has been hung up immediately and exposed to the atmosphere without the intermediate cooling process which has been gone through with your American meat?—Yes; I mean to say that it is the process that preserves the meat. When you slaughter a bullock and hang it in an atmosphere of 85 degrees, instead of chilling it, you heat the outside, and it becomes dry, and the animal heat centres to the bone, and cannot get out, and consequently spoils the meat; whereas, if it is cooled gradually, the animal heat is taken out of the bone, and the marrow and the meat is preserved, and it must commence to decay from the outside instead of from the inside; whilst fresh killed meat commences to decay from the inside instead of from the outside.

Chairman—continued.

2648. We had a witnesss before us at the last meeting of the Committee, Mr. Whitwell, who imported meat from America to Bristol. He stated that he found great differences in the cargoes which he had received; that he had only received five, I think, but that some of the cargoes were not in the same condition on arrival as the others were; have you found in your experience that there is any great variation in the cargoes?—Yes; the meat that Mr. Whitwell referred to belonged to your humble servant. I am the shipper on that line of his. The difficulty there was simply this. The first cargo went in very fine condition; the second cargo went short of ice; that is to say, the ice gave out; they were four days without ice, and the meat became soft. It was not spoilt by any means; the meat was good, but it was soft; not in such prime condition as it would have been in if he had, perhaps, six tons of ice. Then we are, and always shall be, liable to breakages of machinery. Our engines may break down, and if our duplicates are not just adapted to it we may be from 24 hours or 36 hours without running our machinery at sea; the result is that we have a change of temperature, and that will soften the meat; and if it becomes very soft before you get your machinery to work again and get the proper temperature, white or green mould will attach to the meat; it will not sour or smell, but the meat becomes unsightly.

2649. It all depends, then, I suppose, upon the possibility of keeping up the one regular temperature?—Yes.

2650. Is that a difficulty that you experience at all with the present kind of refrigerators in which the meat is shipped?—No, not when you put on ice.

2651. It really is a question simply of a proper supply of ice, to keep the meat in a temperature which will allow it always to be delivered in a condition such as you have described to the Committee, on which you may experimentalise to the extent of hanging it for that number of days in close weather?—It depends wholly upon the proper preparation of the meat before it goes into the vessel; that is the most important thing. The second is, having your box properly prepared. The third is, keeping your machinery in a proper condition, with a supply of means, such as ice.

2652. As the trade extends itself, I suppose, and as the demand for this supply increases, all these precautions will naturally be taken?—Yes; we are all experimenting, hoping to produce something that will bring it more cheaply. Some are hanging it a little heavier; that reduces the price of the freight, and they are testing how closely how many tons to the cubic ton measurement it will do to hang it. The result is, that every now and then they hang it too close together, and they mould it. Every one is trying experiments, in various ways, to get at the best and cheapest mode of doing it; the result is, that very little, while we have a cargo of meat that is in a bad condition. But the meat can be brought in perfect condition under the present process.

2653. Is your export trade limited to Liverpool and Bristol, or do you export to London also?—To London.

2654. Some

Chairman—continued.

2654. Some witnesses have stated to the Committee that the price of much of this meat has fallen very largely in London, and in Edinburgh, and Glasgow, I believe, and that a large quantity was selling for very much less than 6½ *d.* per pound; and they founded on that the argument that the trade could not last, because it would not be remunerative if those prices were all that could be made for it; have you experienced that?—Yes; but this trade in beef is governed by the laws of supply and demand, just as every other trade is that I know anything about.

2655. You mean that it was not in consequence of the meat that was sent over having deteriorated from the process which it had undergone, or from the time that it was on its journey, but that it was simply a glut in the market which prevented its realising its proper price?—I think that was the main cause.

2656. And you state that to the Committee from a knowledge of the sales in London to which the witnesses referred?—I state that from my own personal experience in the trade.

2657. I suppose that, under the conditions which you have stated, it would be perfectly possible to sell it in the port where it arrived, or at markets within a certain radius of that port to which you could send it during a given time; but have you considered the question of how you could distribute that meat throughout the country to the retail butchers, who have probably to keep it over a longer time on account of their demand not being so large as it is in large towns?—I came over with the full expectation of putting up a large refrigerator in Liverpool; I supposed that it would be necessary; but after having been here for two or three weeks, and looking over the ground, I came to the conclusion that it was not practicable and that it was not necessary, and I do not think now that it is necessary.

2658. You do not think that dead-meat stores, established at markets, are necessary for the carrying on of this trade?—I do not.

2659. I understood you to say that you began importing last August?—Yes.

2660. Did you import any quantity at that time into this country?—I keep up a shipment every week, and have kept increasing all the time.

2661. During the hot weather, do you find the same conditions in the meat that you have delivered as you have experienced since?—Yes.

2662. There was no difference prejudicial to the trade from the meat coming over in the hot weather?—Not at all. If the meat is put in in thorough condition before it goes aboard the steamer, you can ship it just as well in the dog-days as you can in December.

2663. Supposing the meat to have the proper preparation which you represent to be necessary, it is in such a condition that it is not affected for some days by change of atmosphere?—Not at all. If you ship it in August in a temperature of 38 degrees, I know of no difference between the August temperature of 38 degrees and the January temperature of 38 degrees as regards its effect on the meat. When your meat gets here, if your butchers in the provinces want meat two or three times a week, they can get it from your London market, or from Liverpool, or from Glasgow; it can be put on the railway trucks in the afternoon, and carried 200 or 300 miles, and delivered the

Chairman—continued.

next morning to the butchers, and he can supply the consumer with it. That meat will keep safely from the Tuesday to the next Friday. On Friday he wants more for the Saturday's market. If he buys meat twice a week he can keep that meat in his shop with perfect safety for three days after it is delivered from either of those ports. Hence I have come to the conclusion that there is no necessity for having refrigerating rooms all over the country, or putting up one myself to protect ourselves at Bristol, Liverpool or Glasgow.

2664. You believe that that would be the case in the hot weather, and that the travelling by the railroad to the different localities in that hot weather, would prevent the meat arriving at its destination in a condition in which it would be marketable?—No, I think not.

2665. I understand you to say that in the trade which you are carrying on, you dispose of the offal, the hides and hoofs, and so forth, in America?—Yes.

2666. Have you ever attempted to send over offal as a part of a cargo?—I have not.

2667. So that you could not state that this refrigerating process would bring offal over in a condition to enable it to compete in the market with the offal of animals which are killed here?—I could not speak from experience, as we have not shipped any.

2668. Do you believe that this trade will extend?—Yes.

2669. If the price which you have mentioned can be maintained, you think there is not only sufficient stock to increase the trade, but that there would be sufficient inducement to American enterprise to continue it for the purpose of getting a dead-meat trade established in this country?—I do. Perhaps there has been no time for the last 10 years when we could have been taken more short than this present season. You will notice that the price of cattle has advanced in America, as the result of the draft that is being made from our herds there for this English market; and I will explain this, so that perhaps the Committee will get a better idea of it. As you see, we commence feeding cattle there two years prior to turning them off. Two years ago last fall our feeders took in their stock cattle at a high price. Last year our market declined on them to such an extent that our farmers, who fatten their cattle, did not make any money out of them; they perhaps got about the same price last spring and summer for their beef that their fatting cattle cost them in the fall; the result was that they lost their crops; and when our farmers lose one crop they try another class of crop; they think, perhaps, sheep or hogs will do better. Hogs were doing much better, and the result was that they did not put in a large amount of fattening cattle last fall, but fed their corn more to hogs and to sheep, so that we commenced this season with a lesser quantity of fat cattle than we have had, perhaps, for the last seven or eight years. Instead of the market declining, as they feared it would, the market has been gradually going up; and now, with the prospect of a good crop before us, and a heavy last year's supply on our hands, the result is, that the amount of cattle that will be fed this coming winter, as compared with the past winter, will range at an increase of 30 to 40 per cent. The result is, that if you want 25 to 30

Mr. *Gillett.*

8 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

per cent. more cattle next year than you have had this year, you have only to beckon to us and we will have them ready for you.

2670. Therefore you believe that this country may look forward to a regular supply from America?—I do.

2671. And that the trade with America, which has started in this way will, from its being a profitable trade, be a continuous one?—I think that it will be a regular line of trade and business.

2672. And one which you believe, from your experience, can be carried out during the whole course of the year, so as to place the meat upon the English market in such a condition that it can compete with meat killed in this country?—I do.

2673. Is there any other point which you would wish to state with regard to this trade?—No; I am ready to answer all questions, but I have nothing to suggest, that I know of.

Mr. *W. E. Forster.*

2674. I suppose you cannot tell the Committee how many head of cattle have been slaughtered for the English market since the trade began?—I cannot.

2675. Can you give us any idea of it at all?—I cannot; I did not know what you desired to know from me or I would have obtained the information.

2676. My reason for asking you the question is, that I want, if possible, to form some idea of the proportion that the consumption of American meat bears to our general consumption of meat, but you cannot give me any information upon that point?—I cannot. You can approximate to it very closely from the port entries at Bristol, Liverpool, Glasgow, and London.

2677. Those port entries will tell us the weight of the meat that has come in?—Yes.

2678. Could you give us any estimate of the proportion which that weight would bear to the number of beasts?—About three bullocks to the ton is a fair average. If you get the port entries and put them together, and divide the result by three, you will have the number of cattle.

2679. Before you thought of importing this dead meat to Europe, had there not been some import of dead meat from the interior of America to New York by rail?—Yes.

2680. Has not that gone on to a considerable extent?—Yes.

2681. Why, then, do you slaughter your animals at New York rather than at Chicago?—Because our machinery for refrigerating is all at New York; and when we have got our meat properly prepared for the vessel, we must have it ready at a particular time. We cannot always get a train of dead meat 1,000 miles just before the steamers are going away. Perhaps the steamboat people say to us, "You can commence loading at one o'clock," and if our train has to come 1,000 miles, we cannot have our beef there exactly at one o'clock.

2682. But New York is a good deal fed by dead meat from the interior towns, is it not?—To some extent it is.

2683. Still you think it is more to your advantage to send the animals alive to New York than to kill them at a distance?—Yes.

2684. The railway journey from Chicago to

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

New York is about 1,000 miles, is it not?—Yes.

2685. How long does that take?—From five to six days.

2686. What arrangements have you for watering the cattle on the road?—We take them off three times and water and feed them.

2687. You take them off at Pittsburgh and Harrisburgh, I suppose?—Yes.

2688. Would you take them off at three distinct places between Chicago and New York?—We always prefer to take them off three times in warm weather.

2689. What is the freight for live animals from Chicago to New York?—Forty-five cents per 100 lbs. now.

2690. Do you think that any of those beasts that are killed for the English market came from Colorado?—No, I think not. I have never seen cattle slaughtered that came from Colorado.

2691. I suppose that you look forward to Colorado supplying the English markets hereafter?—They have not got the quality of cattle there, but they are coming in from these Western and South-western States to us, and buying our short-horn stock that we originally borrowed from you, and they are taking it into those Western territories and Southern States, and they will in a very few years so improve their cattle that they will have a fine high grade of cattle.

2692. Yo do not think that the enormous distance of Colorado, say Denver, from New York, would prevent its being profitable to send cattle from there?—I do not.

2693. What price, do you think here, would stop the trade and make it an unprofitable trade; do not answer the question unless you like?—I named $6\frac{1}{2}$ *d.* a pound as a price. I only tell you that they would probably keep on trying until they got it down to $5\frac{1}{2}$ *d.*; if they found that, that would probably stop it for a little while and rest, and in that time the price of cattle would probably go down a little with us; then we would send it here again, and by the time it got here, your market would be a little up, and we should go on again.

2694. During the last few years what is the lowest price at which it would have been profitable to send it over from New York?—I have furnished a great many hundreds of cattle in New York at $1\frac{3}{4}$ *d.* per pound.

2695. You have great confidence in the future development of the trade?—Yes, I have.

2696. But of course you do not want any legislative measures in England to give you protection for that trade?—No.

2697. You think that it is quite able to take care of itself, and to obtain the development which you believe it will come to reach?—Yes, under our present circumstances. I do not see that we need any legislation. We keep buying of you, and exchanging with you for the finer bloods of cattle, but we have such large herds of fine cattle in our South-western and Western States, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, and Pennsylvania, that we can get along without borrowing any of you for the next four or five years.

Mr. *Chaplin.*

2698. I suppose we may consider, then, that the supply from America will be practically unlimited?—Yes, practically unlimited.

2699. You

Mr. *Chaplin*—continued.

2699. You anticipate, as I understand, that the present supply will certainly continue, and that it will probably increase?—Yes.

2700. At the same price?—What do you mean by the same price?

2701. Do you think that it is likely to increase?—If you mean the price that I named, viz., 6½ *d.* per pound, I say yes; but if it is 5½ *d.* a pound it will probably slacken up until you get hungry.

2702. But is it likely to continue at the price at which it is supplied now?—I think it is.

2703. You have no fear of the hot weather?—No.

2704. I understood you to say that you imported some last August; was it very hot at that time?—We thought it was pretty hot with us; we loaded the Cunard boat "Abyssinia" on the 2nd of August, and the thermometer was 104 degrees in the shade when we loaded.

2705. Have you imported any in the hot weather which we have had in the last fortnight?—Yes, every week, two or three cargoes a week.

2706. With equal success?—No.

2707. With no deterioration?— Yes; there has been deterioration with us, not on account of the weather though.

2708. On account of what; the price?—No, it was not on that account; it was because they did not load ice enough in two instances, and because our machinery broke down in another instance.

2709. That was in the case which Mr. Whitwell mentioned in his evidence?—Yes.

2710. I understand you to say that that was entirely owing to your system not being properly carried out?—That was so.

2711. Do you remember the date of the last importation?—Yes; our last was on the 8th of June 1877.

2712. So far as the transit by sea is concerned, there is not the slightest difficulty?—No.

2713. Is the meat brought in carcases?—No, it is brought in quarters.

2714. It was suggested the other day, by one of the witnesses, that an improvement might be made, by having the refrigerators in more chambers than one; are you of that opinion?—I am.

2715. You think that there would be some practical advantage in that?—Yes.

2716. Is that consistent with what I understood you to say just now, viz., that the perfect transit of the meat by land depended upon the perfection of the process of preparation?—Yes.

2717. But if it was perfectly prepared, you would not require more than one chamber?—Allow me to explain. If you have four compartments, and if you have 500 head of cattle in a vessel, you have them in four compartments, and a machine attached to each of your compartments; if one of your machines breaks down, you jeopardise one quarter of your cargo. If it is all in one compartment, and you have one machine, you jeopardise 500 head of cattle, instead of 125.

Chairman.

2718. Is there not also another advantage arising from your having several compartments, viz., that if the market price does not suit on the arrival of the meat in this country, or if it does not suit for the whole of your cargo, if you had it in divided chambers, you could still keep one or more of the chambers ready for a further market?—Certainly. It does away with the necessity of putting further refrigerators on shore. We have one compartment that carries 1,200 quarters, and we are dividing it, and putting the meat in two compartments; so that if the market does not suit us, we can keep back one half, and sell it the next week.

Chairman—continued.

Mr. *Chaplin.*

2719. Did I correctly understand you to say, that if your meat had been perfectly prepared, it would keep longer than English meat killed in the ordinary way?—It will; or than American meat either.

2720. I suppose that if English meat were killed under the same process, it would keep equally well?—Equally well.

2721. But you think that your meat would travel farther, and keep better, than meat which is killed under the present system in England?—Unquestionably.

Colonel *Kingscote.*

2722. Is it your opinion that the herds of cattle in America have improved during your experience?—Yes.

2723. To what do you attribute their improvement?—To the shorthorns of England. We commenced importing in 1836, that is, before I knew very much about it; and we have kept importing ever since the finest cattle, and crossing them with our native cattle.

2724. Are you aware that the importation of English cattle into America is stopped now?—Yes.

2725. Do you think that that stoppage is a detriment to your country?—At present I do not.

2726. Why not?—I think that we have got as good cattle there as you have here.

2727. I am told that in Texas, where there are large herds of cattle, there is a great demand now for pure pedigreed, shorthorned bulls; can you in America keep up that supply?—I think we can, for the next three to five years. We cannot breed in and in. After we have kept a bull a certain time we can dispose of him.

2728. Still, so far as price goes, it would help those who breed herds of cattle in Texas, if there was an importation from England, would it not?—I do not know; I think that we can furnish them quite as cheaply as you can here.

2729. But still you are sorry to see a stoppage of the importation from this country, for the sake of the consumer?—I would prefer not to see it; but still, I think we shall not be very seriously injured, for the next three years at any rate.

2730. Did I correctly understand you to say that you had had experience in the exportation of live-stock from America to England?—From England to America.

2731. Not from America to England?—No.

2732. You are aware that live cattle do come from America to England, are you not?—Yes.

2733. But you cannot tell me anything about that?—Only that I see them arriving in good condition; I have seen a few of them slaughtered here.

2734. As I understand you, you are a large shipper of dead meat from America to England,

Mr. *Gillett.*

8 June 1877.

Colonel *Kingscote*—continued.

and you would sooner keep on in that trade than go in for the live-stock trade?—Yes.

2735. You think that there is a good deal of risk in bringing live-stock over?—That has been my opinion. It has been more successful than I supposed it would be, but I have not had confidence in it as a permanent thing. They certainly cannot succeed in the winter, in November, December, January, and February; I think it must be very risky indeed.

2736. In spite of the losses which you have sustained by your cargoes with dead meat not coming over good, you still intend to continue that trade?—Most certainly. As a farmer, when I ploughed, I ploughed and sowed; if it failed to rain I could not help it; if I did not get a crop, I did not throw my plough into the corner of the fence, and vow that I would never plough again; but I waited, and trusted to Providence, and I most always succeeded, and I trust I shall again.

2737. You have great faith in farming and dead meat?—Yes, I have.

Mr. *John Holms.*

2738. What price did you get in the London market for what came in indifferent order?—It would sell just according to the prices; there would be some pieces that would not fetch more than 2 *d.* a pound, and some would bring in 3 *d.*, and all the way up to 6 *d.*

2739. Then that which was indifferent sold in the London market at from 2 *d.* to 6 *d.* per lb.?—From 2 *d.* to 4 *d.*

2740. Did the average price of 6½ *d.*, which you spoke of, include all those lower prices?—No, I meant beef in good condition. On those cargoes that are indifferent, and that sell for these lower prices, of course there is a loss.

2741. I think you said that the value of the meat per pound in America, in New York, was 1¾ *d.* per pound?—No; I was asked what price I had furnished meat for, and I said that I had furnished years ago many hundreds of pounds at as low as 1¾ *d.* per lb.

2742. What is the ordinary price of beef in New York?—From the time when I commenced up to the present time it has varied. Our market is governed by supply and demand, of course, but perhaps the average price of the market has been 5 *d.* 10 cents. per lb. in New York for prime beef.

2743. What would be the total expense per lb. of the transport of ice and other costs between New York and this country?—So far as I am concerned, I have no objection to answering the question, but I have some friends who perhaps might think that question personal, and I would rather not answer it.

2744. Of course, this being an experiment, comparatively speaking, the growers are improving the cattle so as to supply our wants, and also you are gaining experience by degrees as to the bringing of meat, for instance, by the division of the chamber into many chambers, and so on; and it is possible that with the unlimited supply which you say exists in America, and with all these improvements, you may have even a lower price than you spoke of just now?—It is possible.

2745. A good deal has been said about the loss to the poor people of this country from the importation of dead meat, by their not having the offal; take an ox of an average weight, say 700 lbs. of dressed meat, could you say what proportion the offal would bear to such a weight?—Do you mean to include the hide in that?

Mr. *John Holms*—continued.

2746. I only mean to include what is eatable?—That would depend very much upon what they eat of it.

2747. What would you describe as offal fit for food?—There is nothing of the inner part of a bullock that is fit to be eaten, apart from the heart and the liver.

2748. And the fat?—Yes; but that we do not eat; we make tallow candles out of the fat.

2749. What would you say was the weight of the liver and heart of an ox weighing 700 lbs.?—They vary; 35 lbs. to 55 lbs.

2750. What would it be in an ox yielding 700 lbs.?—I should think about 42 lbs. or 43 lbs.

2751. You spoke about the quantity of American cattle being without limit; can you give any definite data to the Committee, for instance, as to the exact number of cattle which you have throughout the States, in the same way as we have a clear return in this country of the number of cattle?—I cannot, because I have not the statistics. Of course we know the number of head of cattle in each county and in each State, of the United States; they go to the Statistical Bureau every spring, but I have nothing of the kind with me, and I could not approximate to it.

2752. All the cargoes that arrived at Bristol were not very satisfactory, but I think that you also import to Liverpool?—Yes.

2753. What is your experience there as regards the cargoes arriving in good condition?—We have had very favourable experience there.

2754. How many cargoes have you shipped to Liverpool?—We commenced with one a week, with two a week alternately in five weeks; then we got up to two a week, and then we got up to six a week, and five out of the six come to Liverpool; that is the most we ever had there in one week. I should think we should average, from the 1st of last August up to the present time, say, three a week, and two out of the three would be to Liverpool.

2755. What proportion have you lost at Liverpool out of that number?—We incurred a loss on board the "England," which was the second shipment we ever made, on account of the imperfect box; we have had out of them, perhaps, nine to the best of my recollection.

2756. Then I suppose you do not lose any at all, excepting through the breaking of the machinery, over which you have no control?—No; of course it is subject, like a vessel at sea, to all these breakdowns.

2757. Then the point is simply this: that as you gain experience you may be pretty safe in saying that you will gain certainty in being able to deliver the meat as fresh in Liverpool as when it was killed in New York?—Quite so.

2758. And now it is a question of no speculation whatever, but of certainty?—Yes; we consider it quite as certain as any other commercial businsss that is done from the States to England. I would a great deal rather ship beef than ship bacon or flour.

2759. Is it not the case, that from the fact of that meat, when it is killed at New York, being very

Mr. *John Holms*—continued.

very carefully treated before you put it on board, that is to say, reduced to the temperature which you want to maintain all through, in the hottest weather, that meat when it is delivered in Liverpool would practically keep longer and be better than meat that had been killed at Liverpool itself on the morning that the vessel arrived?—Yes, it will keep longer. I will venture to hang up any amount of quarters of beef against any man that kills his beef this afternoon say, and if mine after it has been killed 21 days does not keep longer than his does, he can have it all.

2760. You said that 5 *d.* might be taken as about the fair price of meat at New York?—I spoke of it as being the average price from last August to the present time; it is much higher now.

2761. At that time what would be the price per pound that you would put upon the offal there?—I do not know that I understand what you mean by the offal.

2762. I mean that which you told us would be about 42 lbs. weight in a 700 lb. ox?—We contract summer and winter with what we called the Bologna sausage-makers.

2763. What would be the price of that?—Sometimes we sell the liver for 42½ or 45 cents, and I think this year we are selling the hearts at 17½ cents.

2764. Is that about 30 *d.* altogether?—Yes.

2765. That is the value of the heart and the liver?—Yes. Then we sell the stomachs also. The little offal as we call it, that is to say the heart, and the liver, and the head, after the meat is taken out, and the hoofs and the entrails we consider worth 1 dollar 45 cents. to 1 dollar 50 cents. That would be on an average, probably about 6 *s.* of your money per bullock.

Mr. *Elliot.*

2766. Is it a fact that several cargoes have quite recently arrived in this country in bad condition?—Yes.

2767. Is that to be accounted for in any other way than by the weather?—Yes, I can account for it by seven cargoes of beef not having been refrigerated. They undertook the shipment without preparation; they were not refrigerated at all; they attempted to put the meat on to the boat and refrigerate it in the boat; which cannot be done.

2768. Did not the hot weather commence a little earlier than was expected this year?—Yes.

2769. Had not that something to do with it?—Yes, it had this to do with it, that it caught them without sufficient preparation; without their refrigerators.

2770. Do they only refrigerate at certain times of the year?—Yes, we need our refrigerators just as much in severely cold weather to keep the meat from freezing as in severely hot weather to preserve it from decomposition.

2771. Does it pay better to send dead meat or live meat from America?—I have not shipped any live cattle; I only know what I am told. I have no personal knowledge of it. If speculators and operators think it to their interest not fully to explain it, they perhaps might not explain it, so that I cannot speak from experience. I only know that I myself prefer to deal with the dead meat.

2772. You said that 5 *d.* per lb. was the price of meat in New York, did you not?—I was

Mr. *Elliot*—continued.

asked the average price from last August to the present time. I should think that that was about the average price.

2773. Is that the price to the consumer?—No, that is the wholesale price.

2774. That does not represent what you put it on board the ship at, of course; you make contracts no doubt, or bring it from your own farm?—No, we buy our cattle at Chicago and in the different States, and that is about what they would cost there to men shipping or to wholesale dealers; it would be about 10 cents per lb.

Mr. *Murphy.*

2775. I take it for granted that your slaughter-houses are near the ship's side?—No.

2776. What distance are they from the vessel?—They vary from one mile to ten miles.

2777. Do you slaughter cattle ten miles away, and then ship them?—Yes.

2778. What time elapses between their being taken from the refrigerator and their being put on board?—That is according to the distance, and it depends greatly upon what time they commence loading. Sometimes they are compelled to keep it a long time on the truck before they can get off to load.

2779. Supposing that the slaughter-house is 10 miles distant from the place of shipping, and that the weather is very hot, does that affect it?—No; we place it on our vans there, which are air-tight, with an oil-cloth. We fill up the van, and turn the cloth over it, and it retains its coolness and is very little affected by the heat in going to the ship.

2780. Have you any idea of what quantity is killed in New York for the purposes of shipment?—I can tell you about what quantity is being killed there weekly now; it is very much increased. We are killing in New York about 1,400 a-week for shipment. There are three of us shipping there.

2781. Is New York the principal shipping port for dead meat?—Yes, they ship more from there than from any other port.

2782. They ship quantities, I suppose, from other ports?—Yes.

Mr. *James Corry.*

2783. Do you supply the machinery for keeping the meat on board the ship?—Yes.

2784. It does not belong to the ship?—No.

Mr. *Torr.*

2785. You say that all meat either is or ought to be subjected to a refrigerating process for one or two days before shipment?—Yes, in warm weather.

2786. And on that depends the success of the operation?—Yes.

2787. Have you public refrigerators that any one can send his meat to?—No.

2788. It is only the shippers who provide refrigerators?—That is all.

2789. When you get your meat on board have you everything to find?—Yes.

2790 You provide space and you provide this machinery that you speak of for pumping cold air?—There are two or three different processes, but each one under his own process furnishes his own materials.

2791. And his own ice?—And his own ice.

2792. Then all the transactions between you

Mr. *Gillett.*

8 June 1877.

Mr. *Torr*—continued.

and the owner of the vessel is payment of so much per ton?—So much per ton cubic measure.

2793. Since this trade has increased very materially, have you found that the freights have advanced upon you?—Not at all; they started with them at a very high rate.

2794. And you have not got those rates down?—No.

2795. Do all the lines of steamers between Liverpool and New York now carry dead meat?—The "Cunard," the "White Star," the "Inman," the "National," the "Guion," and the "Anchor."

2796. Do all those five lines now lay themselves out for carrying dead meat?—Yes.

2797. Do any of them lay themselves out for carrying live meat?—Not from New York, I believe. The "Guion" Line have carried some and the "National" Line are carrying some, but the "Inman" Line, the "White Star" Line, and the "Cunard" Line, I think, are not carrying live cattle.

2798. If they carry live cattle of course they will have to make certain preparations for it, as they have done for your dead meat?—They would require a different kind of space for live cattle. The boats have got to be peculiarly constructed, and the "White Star," the "Inman," and the "Cunard" boats, I think, are not very well calculated to carry live cattle.

2799. Do you think that all these lines are as well adapted for carrying live cattle as they are for carrying dead meat?—No; we can take any clear space in the vessel and build a refrigerator in it; but you cannot carry live cattle in every part of the vessel; you must have them up where they can have air and light.

2800. Therefore you would say that the convenience for carrying dead meat is much greater than it is for carrying live cattle as the vessels are now constructed?—Yes, I should.

2801. Do you anticipate much change in the freight for dead meat?—I do not; I think that if there is any change it will be made lower.

2802. Supposing that your trade increased, as you rather pictured to us that it would increase, do you think that it will affect the freights?—I do not think that it would affect the freight. They are all very well satisfied; it is a very paying rate to them; they are getting more from us per cubic foot than they get for carrying the United States mails.

2803. You do not foresee any serious impediment which is likely to obstruct this dead-meat trade?—Not at all; I see nothing to induce me to believe that it will not be continued, and become a steady, permanent trade and business.

2804. Just as steady as any other trade between New York and Liverpool?—Just so.

2805. Have you found any difficulty in disposing of your cargoes at Liverpool as they have arrived?—No; we find the market sometimes up and sometimes down, as we should find it for any staple commodity.

2806. Have you found it necessary at any time to send any cargoes to other markets, to the interior markets; for instance, to Birmingham or to Manchester, because you could not sell them in Liverpool?—Not because we could not sell them there, but because we could get a better price in Manchester and Birmingham and those other provincial towns.

2807. There has been up to this time a demand in Liverpool, if you take the current

Mr. *Torr*—continued.

market, for all that you have brought?—I do not know that I could say that. I do not think there has. This meat is not consumed in Liverpool, and our market there is from buyers all through the provincial towns.

2808. Do you find that buyers come in from the interior markets now to Liverpool as a centre port for dead meat?—Yes.

2809. And there are now large depôts for the sale of American meat in Liverpool that deal in other meat?—Yes, there are some.

2810. Have you made an estimate of what per-centage of bad meat has come over, taking the time that you have been in the trade, as against your total import?—Including the cargo of the "England," which was almost a total loss, it has been about 7 per cent.

2811. About 7 per cent. of the meat has come in bad condition?—Yes.

2812. As to the relative value of the inferior meat as compared with your prime meat, what would that amount to per lb.?—I should think it would amount to from 2 *d.* to 2½ *d.* per lb.

2813. That is between the average of your inferior meat and the average of your prime meat?—Yes.

2814. You said that there has been a rise in the price of meat in New York since this trade began, but you have not told us to what extent that rise has taken place?—I should think that the rise has been 1 *d.* per lb. there; that would be two cents per lb. in our money.

2815. But yet there is an ample margin for the trade being carried on?—If you will give us 6½ *d.* per lb., I think there is.

2816. What change has taken place in England, and what is the difference, taking Liverpool as your centre, between the market, when it was first opened, and when this dead meat was comparatively unknown, and the market now; has the price risen or fallen?—I think that it has about maintained itself; I do not think that there is any great change. It is not the same each week; the rate goes up and down. I should think that in the average of the market there is but very little change.

2817. And therefore the increased demand has been equal to the increased supply without putting down the price?—Yes, I think quite so.

2818. You spoke of feeding your cattle on grass, with corn; you mean Indian corn, I suppose?—Yes.

2819. Do you thrash that corn before you give it to them?—No; we draw it out of the wagons and put it down, fodder and all.

2820. Is it put down full length in the cobs?—Yes, in the cobs.

2821. And then the pigs follow the cattle?—Yes, they follow and take up all the shatterings and the corn that is undigested as it passes from the cattle.

2822. Where do the pigs go to?—Those pigs go to Cincinnatti, St. Louis, Chicago, and so forth.

2823. But you never send them to this market?—No.

2824. You have never tried the experiment?—Yes; I shipped five in a box, simply to see how I could get them here.

2825. Did the pork keep as well as the beef?—Yes, we could keep the pork without any difficulty at all, but those were shipped without being

Mr. *Torr*—continued.

being entirely refrigerated, or, in other words, before they went to the refrigerator. Our pork slaughter-house is 3½ miles from our beef slaughter-house, and that meat was killed in the afternoon, at 4 o'clock, and put on to the truck the next morning at 9 o'clock, on a very hot day, with the temperature of 87 degrees to 90 degrees, and taken down, some 12 or 14 hours intervening between the time when it was killed and the time when it went into the slaughter-house. It became indisposed at the bone before it went into the refrigerator at all.

2826. Do you anticipate that when this refrigerating apparatus is more perfect you will send pork in large quantities?—I have no doubt that it will be done. We send mutton, and we send it here successfully; and I have no doubt that pork will come. We are sending you Indian corn at such a low rate now that you can feed your own pigs with very great advantage, and if we can get the corn up so high that you cannot feed your own pigs, then we will send you the pigs instead of the corn.

2827. I suppose the black population of the South are still your great customers for pork?—Yes, for bacon.

2828. You look forward each year to carrying on your operations in imported meat with greater certainty, because your means of conveyance, and your knowledge of the trade will have largely improved?—Yes; we are gaining experience every week.

2829. Therefore, your risk is much less?—Yes, much less.

Mr. *Wilbraham Egerton.*

2830. You have been asked about keeping the meat immediately after it is slaughtered; how long can you keep meat in America when it is killed at a temperature of 80° or 90°, or 100° in the shade?—Our butchers kill it in a slaughter-house; they commence killing at 4 o'clock or 5 o'clock in the afternoon, or later if it is extremely hot, and they let it hang up in the slaughter-house with the doors and windows all open with as much air as they can get to cool it. Then early in the morning, at 1 or 2 o'clock, that meat is taken into the butcher's shop; all our butchers' shops are provided with refrigirators, and the meat is put into refrigirators there and then; a quarter is taken out at a time and used for customersas they want it.

2831. Then your butchers do not suffer from meat being tainted as our butchers, unfortunately, very often do in London?—I do not wonder at it, because I have never been into a butcher's shop here that I thought was properly prepared for preserving the meat.

2832. Then it is quite possible that, although your temperature is very much higher in summer than ours, owing, perhaps, to your climate being drier, and to your not having the same thundery weather that we have, and owing also to your having better appliances, you are able to keep the meat in a better condition than the butchers in our large towns in England can?—I should think so.

2833. Therefore that is the answer to any doubt that may have been expressed as to the state of the weather when the animal is slaughtered on your side of the water; that you take such care for the first 12 hours until the meat is placed in the refrigerators, that there is no fear of its

Mr. *Wilbraham Egerton*—continued.

becoming tainted before it is placed in the refrigerators?—If the meat were left to hang in a temperature of say 85° to 90° for 12 or 15 hours, until it started, neither saltpeter nor ice would save it then.

2834. Have you ever heard any complaints that this American meat which has been imported to England sometimes in cooking loses its heart or quality, and shrinks?—I have never heard of such a thing; I have heard the contrary.

2835. Then, if such a case has arisen when the meat was not in a good condition, that has been from some want of care after it has been landed?—It is possible that it might be after it was landed, but it is more likely that it was not properly prepared before it went on board the steamer.

2836. You think that in a short time no complaints of that kind are ever likely to arise as to meat coming from America, either from deterioration of quality or from want of flavour in any way when it is cooked?—No. If you were practical, if you understood butchering, if you understood packing beef and pork, or anything of that kind, you would know at once that there was not a particle of sound philosophy in that. If you take a piece of meat and dry it thoroughly through, being compelled to retain all its juices, and then put into water or into brine, and find that it shrinks, it is the most singular state of things I ever heard of. I always find it to enlarge and become heavier. If you take dried pork or beef, and put it into any solution, it will gain from 10 to 17 per cent., and I cannot understand how a cook would put a piece of American beef that was thoroughly cooled through into water to boil it, or into an oven to bake it, and find it to grow less.

2837. I have heard it stated that the air of the refrigerators when they arrive is very often not very sweet; is the air constantly changed during the passage; is there a constant flow of air through the compartments, or is the air kept at a certain temperature without being changed?—We propose to have our boxes entirely air-tight.

2838. Then there will be no change of air?—If I understand anything about philosophy in air at all, there is no such thing as still air, I have never heard of it.

2839. Then you mean to say that no compartment will be so tight that no air will come in?—We propose in the first place to have our chambers entirely air-tight; we seal them up expecting to have them air-tight, and we have them so as nearly as possible. We produce cold air by a fan principle, blowing it over a body of ice, there is a circulation of air there. That is one process, and there are two or three more on the same principle. The process upon which I ship is on the principle of a solution of salt and ice passing through a coil of pipe, passing entirely round the room. We get a very cold atmosphere from that, and any dampness that may be in the box is attracted to those pipes immediately by the effect of the cold, and the cold air always descending and the warm air always ascending, there must be some place for the warm air to get away, and it cannot get away without producing circulation. As the cold air comes down the warm air goes up.

2840. Then the air keeps circulating in these air-tight compartments?—Certainly.

2841. Do

Mr. *Gillett.*

8 June 1877.

Mr. *Assheton*—continued.

2841. Do you consider that in America you will always be able to compete with our graziers and to supply meat cheaper than we can produce it?—I see no reason why we should not. As long as we can keep pushing out into the west, and raising corn on land that costs us from 1 *l.* to 2 *l.* an acre, I cannot understand why we cannot furnish corn to make beef and pork cheaper than you can on land that is worth 1,000 guineas an acre, perhaps.

2842. I want to know what is the amount of acreage which you have which you think will be available for the grazing purposes of the future; you consider that it is practically unlimited for our purposes?—My own impression is that this trade will increase, and will continue to increase, and I think the result will be that you, as farmers, will have to turn your attention to something more profitable than raising beef on your thousand guinea land. We expect to keep on going south and going west for years and years; we are only in our infantile state, and I think there is no doubt that within the next 20 years we can furnish you 20,000 head of cattle a day if you want them.

Mr. *Jacob Bright.*

2843. What is the lowest price that you have hitherto got for sound beef on this side?—My friend, Mr. Link, does not recollect it, perhaps, as well as I do, for it did not affect his pocket and it did mine. I think in the month of November we had two cargoes of beef sold here, as far as I was ever able to discover, at 3 *d.* per pound, wholesale price.

2844. Was that sold in London?—Yes.

2845. Have you ever sold any at a lower price than that?—I thought that was quite low enough for good beef.

2846. Am I to understand that for good beef that is the lowest price that you would take?—That is the lowest price I would take.

2847. You admit that a good deal of beef has been condemned?—Yes, there has been some condemned; I do not know how much.

2848. I understood you say that it is only condemned through mismanagement?—Allow me to correct you in your term. There is a difference between meat being in a bad condition and being condemned. We, as handlers of meat, understand condemned meat to mean meat which is unfit for human food; and there has not been much of that in comparison with the amount that has come here.

2849. And when American meat that has come here has been unfit for human food, you would say that it is from want of knowledge of the process, or from carelessness with regard to the process?—Yes, it is from want of knowledge and from experimenting.

2850. And with the growth of experience and knowledge you believe there will be very little of that?—Very little.

2851. You have spoken of the meat being thoroughly cooled by the process before it arrives here; how long a time would it take in order to make meat as cold as you think it should be?—We propose to have it as cold as we want it before we start at all.

2852. Supposing that the two countries were nearer to each other, as in the case of continental countries attempting to send dead meat to England, the voyage would be very short, but that would be no objection; you would have the meat sufficiently cool in spite of that?—The meat, in order to make a journey at all in a vessel or on a railway in the hot season, would require just as thorough refrigeration to bring it 500 miles as it would to carry it 5,000 miles. The thing is to get the animal heat out of the meat, and then you can carry it for 10 days, or 30 days, or 60 days, if you keep up your material.

Mr. *Jacob Bright*—continued.

2853. Then you maintain that when your meat lands in England it will keep good as long as, or even longer than, English meat killed at the same moment as the American meat arrives in England?—I claim that it will keep longer; under the process I believe it will keep longer; it is prepared to stand the weather, and it will keep longer.

Chairman.

2854. I think you distinctly state to the Committee, that in the cases in which it has been pointed out that the meat has not arrived here in the condition in which it ought to have arrived, it has been the fault of the way in which it has beeen sent over, and because people in America are now making experiments rather than carrying out an acknowledged established trade?—Yes; then there are those gentlemen who commenced last fall, and when the warm weather came, they had no preparation made for it at all; that was the case with two companies; they had no refrigerators. The hot weather came upon us 15 or 18 days earlier this season than it has ever done before, and the result was that they were caught, as we very often say there, with their pantaloons down. They had their vessels all ready; they had been shipping, and they put their meat on board without its being refrigerated.

2855. And that would be the answer to the evidence which Mr. Swan gave here the other day, when he stated that he did not believe that this trade would continue in the hot weather, and gave it as his reason for it, that if the meat is sold at once it looks very well, for perhaps a day afterwards, but that in the course of a day or two afterwards it decays, and loses bloom, and smells badly; you believe that he must have referred to part of a cargo which had not been properly treated?—Yes; you may take a carcase of your own meat killed here, and hang it up, and the action of the air and heat upon it will take the bloom and that bright red colour off, and it will take a dark line, but it does not become injured, and the moment you cut through that outside crust or scum of the flesh, it is just as fresh as it ever was before.

2856. I understood you to say that it is equally as important to refrigerate the meat in winter as in summer?—Yes; what I mean by refrigeration is to keep the meat in the same temperature, say ranging from 38° to 40°. We think it just as important to have our refrigerators to put our meat in in winter, because we do not want to freeze the meat. If, for instance, you commence killing in our cold climate with the thermometer down to 20°, that cold air striking the meat immediately after killing it, chills the outside and closes up the pores, so that the natural heat of the animal cannot get out; it is shut in, and the meat, as it were, crusts over on the outside; you freeze it up in that condition, and

Chairman—continued.

and as soon as the frost in the outer portion of the meat comes out, it begins to spoil next to the bone.

2857. In fact, it all depends upon the way in which it is prepared?—That is so.

2858. You let fall just now in answer to a question, a word about mutton; have you imported mutton as well as beef?—Yes.

2859. Have you found it answer equally well? Yes.

2860. It was prepared in the same way, of course?—Yes.

2861. With regard to the convenience which you have described of carrying the dead meat as against the live meat from America, I suppose that besides the convenience of carriage there is

Chairman—continued.

also this: that the carriage of the live meat for such a long voyage has innumerable risks attached to it?—Yes; and it is more expensive. You recollect that in taking a good fat bullock, you have about 57 to 58 or 60 per cent. of meat, according to how fat the bullock is; the balance is what we call offal. We cannot afford to pay *27 s. 6 d.* a ton for the carriage of the offal, for there is a large amount of that offal that is digested hay, and that is not very profitable when you get it over here.

2862. Therefore, in your opinion, the dead-meat trade will be a continuous trade in preference to sending over live stock from America, which they have attempted, I understand?—Yes.

Mr. *Gillett.*

8 June 1877.

Mr. Richard Hall, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

2863. I believe you live in Liverpool?—Yes.

2864. Have you been interested in this American dead-meat trade?—No, I have not been interested in it, but I have considered it a very great boon to the public.

2865. What is your occupation?—I am a wholesale butcher, and I am largely interested in the supplying of shipping, and also in the retail trade; and I also have a good many Canadian cattle consigned to me.

2866. In your experience of the trade, have you at all had to do with this new importation of dead meat?—I have only had, I think, about six quarters of it. Some gentlemen wrote to me from the country who were anxious to have it, and one or two of my own customers wrote to me to get them some. That is all, except that I have seen a great deal of it.

2867. From your knowledge and from the experience that you state that you have had of it, are you able to give the Committee an opinion as to the condition in which it arrives?—Yes, I have been frequently offered agencies to take it by Richardson, Spence, and others, and also from Canada, but I declined taking it simply for the reason that it would interfere with my shipping business.

2868. Was it because, having a business of your own, you did not wish to go into a fresh business?—I could not go into it conscientiously with my own business, because I knew that it would not do for supplies for shipping.

2869. But can you tell the Committee, from what you have seen of it, whether you believe that it does arrive in such a condition as to be able to form a good source of supply?—Some of it has arrived in excellent condition, but all of it has been slightly damp, and some of it has arrived in very bad condition.

2870. Are you in a position to say what the cause of that is?—I think from the evidence which I heard the last witness give, if it is to be taken from a slaughter-house 10 miles to New York, that is enough to injure the meat, and there is great risk, I think, in consequence of that.

2871. The last witness stated, as I understood him, that the meat underwent a preparation before it was shipped, the preparation reducing it to a condition of temperature which enabled it

Chairman—continued.

when kept in that temperature to stand the voyage, and, by having been treated in that way, to resist deterioration after it was brought out of that temperature?—It does not; a great re-action takes place. If you will allow me to explain, it is a great boon to the country when it comes in a sound condition, because without it we should have been at a very extreme price; but it only does for a daily supply. I have seen it repeatedly, and I have bought pieces of it and hung it up, and the action of the air upon it in one or two days is very extraordinary; a good deal of it will look like smothered meat.

2872. You have heard the evidence which the last witness gave, and his statement as to his having hung up one of those quarters during the time of his absence in London, and its being perfectly good at the end of that time; your experience does not confirm that?—No, it is quite the opposite.

2873. Do you believe that there will be any possibility, if this meat continues to be brought over, of distributing it through the country, or would the very fact that you have stated prevent the butchers of the districts around large towns coming in for the supply?—When it first came, the agitation was immense throughout the country, and the consequence was that everyone wanted American meat. For instance, one store in Liverpool that was opened was at Compton House in Tarleton-street, and the place and the street was so crowded the first morning (there was an immense supply laid in), that they had to have policemen to keep the street and the shop clear; and a second supply had to be brought in, and it was all sold out by three o'clock; that continued for some weeks, and large demands came from the country in the same way, but they have fallen off.

2874. Those who first brought it into the markets, and took the first two or three cargoes, have ceased to combine to supply themselves with American meat?—They have. In Liverpool, some short time ago, there were eight shops for the exclusive sale of American meat; four of them have closed, and I should think the other four do not do one-half the business; perhaps not more than one-third of what they did. Then again the little butchers, the American meat being so much cheaper than home-killed meat, bought American to mix with their meat. That is

Mr. *Hall.*

Mr. *Hall.*

8 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

discontinued. Again in a low neighbourhood, such as Marybone, in Liverpool, the greengrocers got it to sell, but that has been discontinued. In the Midland Counties, Mr. Hides, of Sheffield, who is one of the largest cattle dealers that we have, was bound to come down to buy American meat and he could not get enough at first. Coming up the night before last I thought I would write him a note to telegraph me here, and he telegraphs me, "The demand has fallen off, there is scarcely any sold."

2875. You represent that he was at first a large dealer in this particular article?—Yes; he was obliged to come to buy it, because they would have that and not his own.

2876. We have had it in evidence that the general supply to the country has not fallen off; can you account for how it has been maintained?—The only place which I think has maintained the demand, and it is because it has been sold cheaper lately, has been London. I think that everywhere else the demand has fallen off.

2877. Do you know what the prices in London have been?—Yes. I come a great deal to London. I often buy and sell hundreds of cattle here; this day week there was sound American meat sold at 2½ *d.* per pound.

2878. The week before, I think, it was fetching a very much higher rate?—I am not aware of that. I daresay it might have done, but lots of it has been sold at 2 *d.* and 3 *d.* per pound.

2879. That, as the last witness stated, arises from two facts, one that the system is not properly developed and that the preparation of the meat has not been carried out as it ought to have been, and the other that people are at present making experiments in order to send it over as cheaply as they can, and that very often they do not take the precautions that are necessary, and that therefore the meat comes over in inferior condition?—I am told, by practical experience, the temperature in the river at New York, in the summer, is so great that the ice in the vessel fails, and that is the cause of it.

2880. But they have the possibility of getting an almost unlimited supply of ice have they not?—Yes, but they have to pay freight for it. You could not estimate the supply of meat, as the last witness told you, by the bill of entry, because I tried it myself. The tons are measured and the ice is measured in; and of course they do not wish to take more than is necessary.

2881. And in fact there may be some reality in that answer, that it is from attempts sometimes to run as close as possible to the price that the meat has deteriorated, and the prices have fallen to the extent which you represent in London?—No, I think that it has fallen in this way: the people do not care about it as they did. It is splendid meat until you come to cook it. I speak without prejudice, because, as I have already stated, I consider its coming a great boon, because we should have been literally starved if we had not had it. I have cooked it in my own house, and I have eaten it hot, and it was literally good, quite as good as a great deal of our English meat; but when you come to eat it cold it is very tasteless and insipid.

2882. Your personal experience of it is not satisfactory?—To tell you a little more about that, Messrs. Lee and Nightingale, who are the agents for the principal newspapers throughout the kingdom, some little time ago came to me for information with respect to it, and I said: "I have a bit of beef left that I had for my Sunday's dinner, and you can taste it for yourself, and judge." And they sent me word that they concurred in my views, and that they preferred the English beef. But this is a most excellent substitute, no doubt, when it comes sound.

2883. Though you think that it is a very admirable addition to our present supply, you do not believe that it will ever be a substitute for English meat?—I do not believe that it will ever be a substitute for English beef, and I am apprehensive whether it will last to pay them; I hope it may.

2884. That is a question upon which you do not speak, I suppose, with any personal experience?—No.

2885. I suppose that one advantage of the trade with regard to the people of this country is that the offal does not come over with the meat?—No; the offal does not come over, and that offal is what goes into general use for the poorer classes of both Liverpool and all throughout the United Kingdom. The last witness told you about the offal, but he forgot to tell you of the tail, he forgot to tell you of the kidneys, and he forgot to tell you of the head and the tripe; but I do not want to conceal anything from you, and I will tell you everything truthfully.

2886. I understood the last witness to say that those things were utilised for other purposes in America?—He was asked what he described as offal, and he said the fat, the liver, and the heart.

2887. What the last witness said was, that the blood was used as a fertiliser, and the heart and the liver to make sausages; that the bones were reduced to bone-dust to be used in America; that the guts and feet were boiled off, and the residue used as manure?—He did not tell you of the tail, or of the kidneys, or of the head.

2888. It may be possible that the last witness did not mention them because their market there consumed the supply, and that they merely sent the carcase over to this country?—Exactly, because the offal would not keep to come; it would be entirely spoilt. The action of the ice would destroy it, and make it damp; when it got here it would not be saleable at all, and the liver would have to be thrown to the pigs.

2889. I understand that the system under which it comes over is that there is no actual contact with the ice at all, but that the atmosphere is merely kept at a certain temperature by a process of ice pipes, which does not imply any dampness in the actual chamber itself?—It is singular if such is the case that when it comes out it is all damp; I never saw any come out that was not damp.

2890. May not that be the effect of the action of the atmosphere on its first being brought out of the temperature in which it has been kept?—It may be so, but it is all damp.

2891. You say it is impossible to bring offal over; are you aware that offal is brought over to this country, not from America, but from the continent?—No, I am not.

2892. You have not heard that it was stated to a previous Committee in 1873, and that it has been stated also by Professor Brown here, that such is the case, and that offal is brought from abroad, and that it is carried by railroad to the markets

Chairman—continued.

markets in this country, and that it does sell in those markets for food?—I should think that it is totally unsaleable.

2893. You cannot say that it is not the case?—I cannot positively say that it is not the case; but I have had a great deal of practical experience of the business for very many years, and I am not aware of it.

2894. It has never come under your notice that the offal which you have sold has been offal which has come from abroad?—No, never.

2895. And your own judgment is that it could not be so brought, and sold for consumption?—No.

2896. Can you speak as to the shipping interest?—In consequence of the steamers bringing such large quantities, and these gentlemen paying such very large freights to the steamers, the steamers commenced to take the American meat. Of course those gentlemen connected with the trade were anxious to sell it to me, and I told them that I could not do the companies such an injustice; that I would rather lose the business than sell it to them, because I felt convinced that it would not answer their purpose. I am speaking now of the very steamers that bring it; the consequence was that some of them left me without orders, and others gave me an order for perhaps a couple of hundred pounds; now they have come back, and the last order of those that left me without an order was 3,400 lbs., though they could buy the American meat at very much less per pound. Those gentlemen who were in the American trade were desirous to send me American meat to supply the steamers, and I said I could not do the steamers such an injustice, because I knew what it would be, because the American meat after it has been a few days in the ice smells. In one steamer I smelt it, and it smelt just like a corpse, like a body just before the coffin is closed.

2897. That was in consequence of its being placed in ice after it had been transhipped?—Yes.

2898. Would it not be possible for these steamers to fit up for themselves a small refrigerating room in which they could keep their meat?—I do not know that; I am simply telling you the facts as they stand; you may be sure that they would desire to serve these gentlemen, who are very large customers to them.

2899. And the practical result is that, although they would get it at a cheaper rate if they so supplied themselves, they have continued the orders to you to the extent which you have said?—Yes. Then, again, during this week in London, I have it from most reliable authority, that there has been 30 tons of Canadian and American meat together seized.

2900. Do you know where that came from?—I do not know; some of it would come from Canada, and some from New York, I presume; that was this week, and the weather has been comparatively cold this week.

2901. You cannot state where that meat was landed?—I cannot; but it is almost impossible in hot weather to keep meat which is landed at Liverpool to come to London, because you yourself, I dare say, from your experience in travelling on a hot day, when you have even the windows open, find it most oppressive, and what must it be in vans which are closed up? I have bought large quantities of meat in Deptford, and killed it, and brought it to Liverpool, and it would not do; and I have killed it in London and brought it to Liverpool, and it would not do; I sent some to one company, the "National Steam Company," and the consequence was that when the vessel came back a portion of the meat was spoilt, and they deducted 350*l.* from my account; that was the beef of animals which had been rested for two or three days in London before being killed, and then killed and cooled, and brought to Liverpool, and put into the steamer.

2902. But it had not been submitted to a refrigerating process before it was started on the railroad?—No; but no meat will stand much handling, the less it is handled the better.

2903. Especially in hot weather?—Especially in hot weather.

2904. What you would tell the Committee is that you cannot confirm the last witness in thinking that the trade will be established, and that it will supersede in any way the present trade?—I fear that it will not, I hope that it may continue to come in good condition; for meat is a great deal too dear, and it is much better for us to have it cheap. I have a great deal more faith in the live-meat trade. My Canadian friends have been most anxious to send me dead meat, and I have said, "No, do not; it will end in disappointment and loss, and I do not want a commission in a thing that would be a loss to you, because it will be most unpleasant for all concerned."

2905. Have you dealt largely in the live trade from America and Canada?—Yes; the first large cargo that came into London was consigned to me last year. There were a few the year before, belonging to John Bell & Sons, of Glasgow, but they came in rather a wasted condition; they were landed in the Victoria Docks, and they received a great deal of harassment.

2906. Were they from America, or from Canada?—I think they were from America. The first cargo that came in perfect order was landed last June on the Sunday, at Thames Haven, and sold in the London market on the Monday; and the "Times" and all the newspapers spoke of the splendid condition that the cattle came in. There were 102 of them, they came by the "Temperly" line.

2907. I suppose that the length of the voyage makes it a considerable risk whether they come over in good condition or not?—It does. The man that brought them said that they had actually improved on the voyage; they were the theme of admiration in the London market.

2908. They must have had a very good passage?—They looked like a team of hunters coming out of a stable. Last week, in Liverpool, there was a cargo of 101 sold to Mr. Burrell, of London, at 32*l.* per head, and several lots that have come have averaged 35*l.* to 36*l.* per head; last year the trade was only in its infancy, and doubtless it will increase, but I hope they will both increase, because we want them.

2909. Can you give the numbers showing how the live-cattle trade from America has increased since it started?—I can only give you the numbers so far as Liverpool is concerned, though I have had many landed in London also. At Liverpool last year there were only 1,631; this year, up to the 5th of June, there have been 1,574; and I should think that there would be 20,000 landed throughout the United Kingdom this year, most of them of very fine quality indeed.

2910. It

Mr. *Hall.*

8 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

2910. It is a growing trade, in fact?—A very growing trade.

2911. Can you tell the Committee what is the comparative cost of sending live animals and dead meat to this country?—Live animals must be dearer, but when they get here the meat is much better; you cannot get better meat than the American bullock, and the dead meat would be the same, but it is the ice that draws the flavour of it away.

2912. Have you any figures that you could put before the Committee showing the comparative cost of the two trades?—No, I do not know what their expenses are; I can tell you what are the expenses of the live cattle, but not about the dead meat. There was a cargo of 278 cattle brought the other week by Layland steamer, "Istrian"; had the importer had 300, there was space for 300, and they would have come for 1,400*l.*; but in Montreal they are charging them 7*l.* per head, including fittings. The time was limited, and the importer, who shipped per "Istrian," could only send 278, which all arrived sound alive.

2913. But you may take 1,400*l.* as the cost of sending 300 cattle?—Yes.

2914. That is under 5*l.* per head?—Yes.

2915. Did that include all the expenses of food?—No, they have to pay for fittings and forage; I think you might put it down at 6*l.* per head.

2916. You think that you may take that as the average price?—Yes; then in Montreal they are charging more; the shippers are all anxious to get here with them, and they are competing with each other.

2917. You say that they are competing against each other in price?—All the shippers are anxious to send their cattle here, because they think that beef will rule very dear for the next few weeks; and they all want to come first, and therefore one has been bidding against the other to procure freight.

2918. Therefore that is not perhaps a fair criterion of what the price will be?—No, it is not a fair criterion. I cabled out, some months ago, saying that our grass-beef would be very late, and that the Scotch and Irish beasts would be done very much earlier than usual, and that I was sure there would be a very good market; and it has made them all anxious, and that has raised the markets. The whole of the freights of the Allan steamers are engaged by Bells, of Glasgow, but I do not know what freight they are engaged at.

2919. You cannot give the Committee any notion of what the cost of bringing the dead meat is?—I cannot.

2920. But you represent that the American live-meat which is sent over at that cost has a good market in this country?—It has a good market, and it is very paying indeed. Mr. Snowdon, who sold the 101 bullocks last week, has gone back to bring 300 by the first steamer he can get.

2921. The trade has not been sufficiently long established to test the question of deterioration in really rough weather, has it?—In rough weather there have been losses; there is one firm, the firm of Barber & Coghlan, who were very unsuccessful indeed last year in losses. They were two young men, and they wanted money; and I had to make advances, or, rather, I had to meet their bills; and, after that, they made nearly 2,000*l.*, 1,000*l.* apiece.

Chairman—continued.

2922. You believe that the profits are sufficiently large even to stand the losses that would be likely to occur in consequence of the length of the passage and of the weather?—Yes. There is another question: we are very badly off in Liverpool for lairage; our health committee will do nothing for us. In the first place, when the Canadian cattle arrive, I think that being a British possession, and never having had any disease there, either foot-and-mouth disease, or pleuro-pneumonia, or rinderpest, they should be put on the same terms as the Scotch and Irish beasts when landed.

2923. You would represent that Canada should be treated as a part of the United Kingdom?—Exactly so, as long as they have never had any disease. Instead of that, there is no proper lairage, and they remain on the quay for 12 hours, which frequently does them more damage than the whole of the sea-voyage.

2924. Is there anything else that you wish to say in relation to the question before the Committee?—If there is any other question that you would like to ask me, I shall be glad to answer it.

Mr. *Arthur Peel.*

2925. What effect had the dead-meat trade when it was at its full extent in Liverpool upon the prices of live-meat?—It caused them to be lower, because people considered that the butchers had been robbing them; and the consequence was that they all flew to American meat, and the markets were very languid.

2926. You say that there were eight shops for the dead-meat trade, and that four of them have shut up?—Yes.

2927. What was the class of the shops that was shut up; were they exclusively for the American dead meat?—Yes.

2928. Were they new shops?—Yes, they were open for that purpose.

2929. They were not old butchers who had gone into the American dead-meat trade?—No.

2930. Do you think that the dead-meat trade was treated without prejudice in Liverpool?—Yes; I went to the editor of the "Daily Post" and got him to write about it, because I thought that it was of the greatest advantage to us.

2931. I do not refer to the action of the press, so much as to the action of the butchers?—The action of the butchers who were contracted in their views might be prejudiced.

2932. Did you ever hear of butchers selling inferior English meat as imported American meat?—I have heard of the American people doing it, and I have heard of little butchers doing it also.

2933. Why should the Americans do it?—I suppose that they were short of supplies, and so they bought inferior English and Scotch meat, and it was exposed for sale. I exposed them myself, because I believe in everything being straightforward; they bought inferior English and Scotch beef and old ewe mutton, and sold it as American meat; that occurred in Liverpool.

2934. But you told us that in London last week they sold it at 2*d.* a lb.?—Yes; but I am now speaking of the time when the shops were first opened.

2935. Is any dead English meat sent from Liverpool

Mr. *Arthur Peel*—continued.

Liverpool to London?—A great deal; I have sent a great deal at times, and other butchers have done the same.

2936. By what process is that preserved in the vans?—In the same way as the American meat.

2937. In ice?—No, the English meat is not sent in ice from Liverpool; it will keep well enough for daily supply; it always arrives in good condition if it is sent fresh.

2938. Are you at all apprehensive that if the dead meat trade is established that there will be a greater readiness on the part of the authorities to prohibit the introduction of live stock altogether. If the authorities are satisfied that the dead meat trade is an accomplished fact, do you think that they will be more ready to put restrictions on the importation of live cattle in the event of disease existing in a foreign country?—Doubtless they will. I myself was examined some years ago when rinderpest was rife, and I myself advised the stoppage of the transit of cattle for the time being at the port of disembarkation; it was a great hardship to the working classes, and to the Midland Counties, but that was better than that our herds should be "decimated."

2939. You stated that the live cattle which have been introduced from America were in very excellent condition?—Yes, as a rule.

2940. Do you agree that during some months of the year there is a very great risk and an almost absolute impossibility of introducing live cattle from America?—Not an impossibility, because I believe that they have come nearly every month this year. They could not come of course from Montreal, because the St. Lawrence is frozen.

2941. I suppose that there is a great risk in bringing live cattle?—There is a risk, but they have had very little loss this winter. The National and other companies' boats that are bringing them are very large fine boats.

2942. You think, as a matter of profit, that you would rather deal with the live meat than with the dead meat trade?—Certainly.

2943. As a matter of commission?—There is more commission on the dead meat than there is on the live meat. Any salesman having dead meat to sell has a larger commission.

2944. Precisely; contrary evidence has been given; I only asked you the question to see whether you agreed with that?—A bullock in London is sold at 4 *s.* if it is under 30 *l.*, and they charge 1 *d.* a stone for selling dead beef.

2945. But you are indifferent?—No, I am not indifferent. I would not deal with the trade because I know it would be very cruel to steamship owners to put it on board their vessels, because, supposing that they have a large number of emigrants and passengers, and the meat spoils, they have no backdoor to run out at to get fresh meat.

2946. Do you know any instance in which the passengers have suffered from the meat not being fresh?—I do not; I do not know the cause, because the steam companies are not likely to tell me. I have always been apprehensive of it simply for this reason; that supposing that this meat spoils on the passage, what is to be done? and I apprehend that some of it must have spoiled on the passage or else they would not have returned to me to have given me more money, more particularly when I

Mr. *Arthur Peel*—continued.

am not a customer of theirs, as these American importers are.

2947. Do you know of more than one instance in which complaints have been made by the passengers of the smell of the dead meat from the chambers?—I have not heard of any instances.

2948. You are only apprehensive of its occurring?—I was apprehensive of it from the first, from my practical knowledge that it would be so.

2949. Has it been so?—I do not like asking questions from steamship owners, because it is wise not for me to do so; but one would naturally suppose that they would not come and pay me so much more per lb. after leaving me altogether if the American beef answered their purpose, more particularly when these gentlemen were paying them 700 *l.* or 800 *l.* freight for every voyage.

2950. Do you regard the appearance of "sweating" as it has been termed on the American meat, as a sign of the deterioration of the meat?—The meat becomes very damp and clammy, particularly if it is two or three days old and the weather is bad; and under the flank parts it will be soft and mouldy, and under the suet perhaps it will be spoilt. As for talking about its keeping as long as English meat it is nonsense.

Chairman.

2951. That is an idea of yours?—No, it is practical knowledge, because I have bought it and hung it up and tried it.

Mr. *Arthur Peel.*

2952. Will you explain in detail the actual experiments which you made with the American meat and with the English meat, because the last witness gave us clear evidence of some experiment that had been tried?—Yes, he gave you this evidence: that if English meat is cut up fresh, and it hangs for two or three days, it becomes black outside and dry. If you pass a butcher's shop you will see legs of mutton hanging so, but the meat will be dry of itself, and the American meat will not. The American meat gets discoloured and goes soft and pappy.

2953. Have you seen that yourself?—I have seen lots of it day after day, not in my own shop but in others. I am not at all antagonistic to American meat; I wish it would come in quantity.

Colonel *Kingscote.*

2954. You told us that several of those people who sold American meat in Liverpool had failed or had given it up?—They closed their shops; I do not know that they failed.

2955. Were those people who you said sold this American meat, and who no longer do so, butchers, or had they merely got a new interest and started this as an experiment?—One or two were butchers, and one or two, I think, were not butchers.

2956. In fact they were people who, seeing a new trade, thought they would try and get something out of it, and found that they could not?—Doubtless they did.

2957. Are you aware that American meat has been sold this morning in London at 7 *d.* per lb.?—It is very likely indeed.

2958. How do you reconcile that with the statement

Mr. *Hall.*

8 June 1877.

Colonel *Kingscote*—continued.

statement that it has been sold at 2 *d.*?—That was last week. The market this morning is very bare of all kinds of meat. I dare say there would be some English meat sold this morning at from 8½ *d.* to 9 *d.* per lb. if it has come up in sound condition. Sound meat is sure to sell well.

Mr. *John Holms.*

2959. You have just stated that those persons who had taken up this trade in Liverpool gave it up very soon?—They have only closed within the last few weeks.

2960. Was it the case that the butchers of Liverpool did not care about having American meat at first?—Some of them were prejudiced enough not to care about it, but I hold that its coming was a great boon to the country.

2961. Did many of the butchers take it up subsequently and sell it alongside of their own?—Many of them did.

2962. Would not that account for those new people giving it up?—Not at all, because those butchers have given it up as well as the new people.

2963. You say you do not think that we can depend upon the supply from this source?—I do not think that you can depend upon a safe supply in hot summer weather.

2964. You do not, I suppose, mean that we cannot depend upon a safe supply, because there is not the supply in America?—No, not at all.

2965. Have you studied the preparation of meat on the American side, and also the mode of carrying it over?—Yes.

2966. You do not believe that the system will give us sound meat?—I think that it is dangerous at times, for the reason I told you, that coming down the New York River, the temperature is very high indeed, and the ice is apt to go.

2967. I think you stated that we should have literally starved in this country if we had not had this supply?—It would have been out of the reach of the working classes. We should have had beef, I dare say, at from 1 *s.* to 1 *s.* 3 *d.* per lb.

2968. If the working classes have been saved from starvation by its having come to us, may it not be that we may have a improved supply, so that the better class also may take the meat?—The higher classes of society will not take it up for this reason, that it becomes tasteless. It is quite as tender, and more so, than a great deal of ours, but if you eat it cold it is very tasteless.

2969. But if they improve the mode of bringing it over, so that it may be eaten in this country as well flavoured as it is in America, may not the better classes also in this country partake of it?—Certainly.

2970. You had some importations of live cattle from Canada which you say were sold; at what rate per lb. were they sold?—They would sell at 9 *d.* per lb. live weight, and offal 1 *d.*; the carcases would be 8 *d.*

2971. Prime American meat arriving in a dead state has been sold at what price?—I should think that on the average the American meat, since the trade has been established, has not fetched more than 5¾ *d.* per lb.

2972. Then, practically, that which comes dead is sold a great deal cheaper, two-thirds of the price of that which comes alive?—Yes.

2973. A good deal is made of this question of offal, because a person said that the poor people

Mr. *John Holms*—continued.

do not get the advantage here by dead meat coming that they get by having cattle killed here; are you in a position to tell the Committee precisely the value of each part of the animal if we go through it; could you tell the Committee what you would call the average weight of dressed meat that is produced out of an averaged sized bullock?—The offal that you speak of for the poor is the kidneys, the liver, the heart, the head, the tripe, and the feet; not the tongue nor the tail are used for the poor.

2974. Can you tell us the value of each of those?—Putting it altogether, about 16 *s.* that is sold to the poor.

2975. And what would be the weight of that out of an ox?—From 26 lbs. to 30 lbs., not including tripe, tail, and tongue.

2976. Then it is a great deal less than 5 per cent.?—Yes.

2977. Have you anything to do with the bringing of live cattle from Aberdeen?—No.

Mr. *Norwood.*

2978. You stated, did you not, that you had not considered it consistent with your position to supply shipping with American dead meat?—Yes.

2979. The evidence has been chiefly with regard to supplying the passengers on board ships; would your opinion be equally strong with regard to supplying the crew?—The meat will not take salt.

2980. And you would consider it very wrong to supply a vessel for the purpose of the crew with American meat without distinctly stating that it was so?—I have the largest shipping business in Liverpool, and I have never put a pound of American meat on board a ship yet. I could have got plenty of money out of it, but I would not do it, and I never did it.

2981. Are you aware that imports of live cattle into Southampton are proceeding this very year briskly, and in very prime condition?—Yes.

2982. Are you aware that last week a parcel of live cattle arrived from New York, and was in a condition to be slaughtered the next day?—I am not aware.

2983. Or that horses came, and were trotted the next day in harness?—No, I am not aware of that, but I have seen cattle come out as fresh as out of their own stables.

2984. Do you deal in other foreign cattle besides the American and Canadian?—Yes; I have imported other cattle.

2985. Taking a national, broad view, and not merely that of a large butcher, would it or would it not be a national advantage to prohibit the importation of live cattle from, say, Germany, Holland, and Denmark?—I do not think they could send dead meat in condition; they have no steamers so well adopted as the American vessels.

2986. Supposing that it were contemplated to prohibit by law the importation of live cattle from any part of the world to England, would that, in your opinion, be a national advantage or a serious calamity?—A very serious calamity, because the Germans would not send them, but would find other markets for them.

2987. Have you considered whether the cost of bringing dead meat is not very much greater in proportion to the distance for short distances than

Mr. *John Holms*—continued.

than for long distances?—I do not know that I have.

2988. Have you ever heard, in your experience, of offal being brought here from abroad?—No; I have never heard of it, and I think, if it came, it would sell for very little money.

2989. Supposing that it was not lawful to import live cattle from abroad, but that all meat must come dead, would there be great risk of partially diseased meat being imported here for human food?—Very great risk.

2990. It might really come half diseased; are you of opinion that the conveyance of dead meat is very problematical, and that the prohibition of the import of live cattle from abroad would be a very great calamity?—A very great calamity.

Sir *Rainald Knightley*.

2991. I think you stated that last week the price of American beef in England was 2½ *d.* per pound?—In the London market this day week.

2992. Was that the average price or the lowest price?—I do not think it was the average price.

2993. What was the price of English beef in the market at that time?—Perhaps 7 *d.* per pound, or 7½ *d.* per pound for the best beef.

2994. Then there was a difference of 5 *d.* per pound between the English and the American beef; to what do you attribute that?—Because the American meat came in bad condition, but still it was sound; the inspectors could not seize it.

2995. Still, though the English beef sold at 7½ *d.* per pound, the American beef, which was sound, sold at 2½ *d.* per pound?—Yes; it was as sound as this, it was so sound that the inspector could not seize it.

2996. Do you know what the average price at New York is?—No; but in the case of the bullocks that are bought in Chicago that the last witness spoke of, 1¾ *d.* per pound, it is the live-weight price of them, put on the machine they can weigh perhaps 40, or 50, or 60 together; it is not the dead weight; it is not the carcase.

2997. You attribute the meat coming in this almost unsaleable condition, and having to be sold at 2½ *d.* per pound, to the insufficient and bad arrangements of the vessel?—I cannot tell. I think, in the first place, the slaughter-houses being 10 miles from the port of embarkation, is injurious; and, in the second place, coming down the New York River, with a high temperature, it is very likely that the ice will be lost.

2998. You do not agree with the last witness, that if proper precautions are taken, American meat to any amount can be imported into England quite as sound and quite as good as English beef?—It never can be; or, at least, it must be with a new process; it cannot be by the present system.

2999. Then you differ from the whole of the evidence of the last witness?—Not the whole; I agree with him that very large quantities can come; it is only as to the condition in which it can come that I differ from him.

3000. If American beef is selling at such a low price, it can only be imported here at a dead loss to the importer?—Exactly so.

3001. Are you aware that since this trade commenced, about a year ago, the price of American beef has been gradually increasing?—It has; but I think you will find now that it will

Sir *Rainald Knightley*—continued.

stop. It did rise in price, because the papers had been agitating week after week, and the conversation everywhere had been about nothing but American beef. Now everybody has had it, and I think people are tired of it. I do not think that the price will increase now, because in the Midland districts, Manchester, Sheffield, and Birmingham, the demand is falling off.

3002. The last official returns, I think, were larger than any of the previous ones?—I daresay they might have been.

3003. Does it not appear to you extraordinary that people should import at a loss?—It is a question whether they will continue it.

3004. There they are, and they flourish?—I do not think that they will continue at a loss, and I hope that they will not sustain any more losses.

3005. You say that you have more faith in the live trade; have you ever calculated what is the cost per pound of importing live animals?—Yes; it will be about 2 *d.* per pound.

3006. Do you know what is the cost per pound of importing dead meat?—I do not know, and I do not like giving an opinion upon a matter that I do not know.

Mr. *Torr*.

3007. You said, did you not, that the import of dead meat was problematical, but that in the import of live stock there was not so much risk?—There is a risk, no doubt, in bringing it, but notwithstanding the risk of any loss that they may sustain, the importers have all made money in it, and are increasing their quantities.

3008. How can you say that the import of dead meat is problematical, when it has now been going on for 18 months; you have tasted the meat yourself, no doubt?—Yes.

3009. Can you say that you have never tasted a good piece of American beef?—I do not say that I have never tasted a good piece of American beef. It is very tender and tolerably juicy, but it is short of flavour when hot, and it is very insipid when cold.

3010. What is the highest price at which you have known American beef to sell?—I have known a hind quarter of American beef to be sold in Liverpool at, I think, 7¼ *d.* or 7½ *d.* per pound.

3011. You are connected greatly with retail butchers, are you not?—Yes; but do not supply any of them.

3012. Have you any quotation from retail butchers?—The companies themselves have advertised that they sell the roasting pieces at 8½ *d.* per pound. It has not been so particularly cheap at that, they cut it very long, with immense pieces of suet; they have to do that.

3013. If I tell you that I have myself seen and eaten a piece of American beef that cost 10¼ *d.* per pound, and that I never ate better beef in my life, would you say that that was not a fact?—No; I could not say that it would not be a fact, because perhaps you got it from your own butcher.

3014. No; I got it from one of those butchers of which you are aware there are now several, 10 or 15?—There were never more than eight, and there are four of them now closed. Compton House advertised to sell roasting pieces at 8½ *d.* per lb.

3015. This

Mr. *Hall.*

8 June 1877.

Mr. *Torr*—continued.

3015. This was not from my own butcher, but from one of those American stores; the price paid was 10¼ *d.* per lb., and the meat was in splendid condition. You admit that the damage in a great many instances to this meat has been caused by the slaughter-houses being far from the shipping, and by other drawbacks?—I infer that it is from that; in fact experience tells me that it is from that, and also I should infer that it is from the ice being wasted.

3016. Presuming that those deficiencies and defects were remedied, do you admit that American beef would be imported in a form as good as English beef?—Not with ice; but if they get some other process, it may be. The ice takes away the flavour.

3017. That is when it comes in contact with ice; but you are aware that the beef imported does not come in contact with ice?—I do not know what causes it. The air is drawn from it. If you have a glass of champagne, and you put some ice in it, you see outside the moisture on the glass.

3018. No one knows the beef trade better than yourself; would you not think that it is fair evidence that these men cannot have been losing the money by it that you imply that they have done?—I hope they have not. I do not wish them to. I wish the American beef to come.

3019. Are you aware that the steamers which bring this beef give their own sailors and cabin passengers this beef?—No, quite the contrary on the outward voyage. They did do so, but they have changed; they have come back to us.

3020. I beg your pardon again there. I have been on board one of the Inman boats, and have had a large piece of beef served up to a large party of gentlemen; it had been killed and hung up for 13 days, and not one of them could tell that it was not prime English beef?—You will find out on inquiry that Mr. Inman will not order any to go back with to America for his steamers.

3021. Mr. Inman himself presided at the dinner table; he gave them nothing else, and after the luncheon was over he said, "Now, gentlemen, I give you nothing but this slice of beef, do you approve of it?" and with one consent they all said they never tasted such a fine piece of beef in their lives; and he then said, "Well, gentlemen, this is a piece of American beef taken out of my stores." Nobody knows beef better than you do; are not those facts which contradict your facts?—I can only tell you that I supply Mr. Inman's steamers, and that Mr. Inman does not order beef for his steamers to take back to America.

3022. I think that your principal business is in the supplying of ships?—Yes; and a great deal of retail trade also.

3023. You are the largest supplier of meat to ships, and especially to passenger ships, in Liverpool, are you not?—Yes.

3024. You have never yet ventured on sending any American beef on board those ships?—No; never. Some of them took the business away, and I let it go, because I knew that they would return to their old love; and they did.

Mr. *Assheton.*

3025. Have you ever noticed that if you bring a bottle of iced water into an ordinary dining-room, in a short time the moisture from the atmosphere condenses on the outside, and the bottle becomes wet?—Yes.

Mr. *Assheton*—continued.

3026. Does not that explain to you why, when you take a carcase out of a temperature of 37 degrees, and bring it on to a quay where the temperature is, perhaps, 70 degrees, it becomes moist?—That tells you that the action of the air will cause it to spoil soon. It gets soft and muggy immediately, and the action of the air causes it to spoil.

3027. Do you not see any analogy between bringing a bottle of iced water into a warm dining-room and bringing a carcase of meat out of a cold chamber on to a warm quay?—Precisely. I should like, when our Member is in town, to buy the best piece I can buy; and he shall come and see it fresh, and he shall come and see it in two or three days, and he will not know it to be the same piece.

3028. Does not the analogy of the water-bottle explain to your mind, as it does to mine, why the outside of the beef becomes moist?—There is nothing so destructive to meat as moisture.

3029. That is scarcely an answer to my question. Does not the analogy of the water-bottle explain to your mind, as it does to mine, the reason of the outside of the beef becoming moist?—Yes.

3030. From your experience as a butcher, do you not think that meat carefully killed in America and carefully prepared and preserved in a regular temperature will keep better than beef killed in England in a thunderstorm?—Perhaps it might to use in America, but we do not have so many thunderstorms.

3031. Perhaps you think that they have as many thunderstorms in America as we have here?—Very likely they may have. I do not know.

3032. They say dreadful things of butchers; did you ever come across an instance of a butcher buying tough, lean, old cows, and selling them for American beef to discredit American beef in these markets?—I believe that such things have been done. I believe that it was done in Manchester and other places. I do not know whether it was done to discredit it or not, but they called it American beef. It was so reported in the papers; I do not know whether it was so or not.

Mr. *Jacob Bright.*

3033. You said in the course of your evidence that 30 tons of American beef had been condemned this week; on what authority did you make that statement?—All the seized meat goes to Deptford, and it is put down to boil, and I had it from those who had come from Deptford. It is all weighed on machines there, and then it is put into vessels to boil down.

3034. It is a statement to be relied upon?—Yes, it is a reliable statement.

Chairman.

3035. It is not an official statement?—They are not allowed to give an official statement.

Mr. *Jacob Bright.*

3036. Do you know at what price American beef has been selling to-day in London or in Liverpool?—I do not think much will be selling in Liverpool. One gentleman tells me that it has been sold at 7 *d.* per pound in London.

3037. If

Mr. *Jacob Bright*—continued.

3037. If American beef is selling to-day in London at 7 *d.* per pound, do you know what English beef is selling at in London?—I should think at 8½ *d.* or 9 *d.*

3038. How do you account for that difference in price?—Because the one is so much superior to the other.

3039. Because the one is insipid and the other not?—Exactly.

3040. Is it generally admitted that American beef is insipid?—Yes; when I first tried it I had it for dinner. I would not tell my children that it was American meat, fearing that they would be prejudiced, and I said, "This is very nice." In the evening, after smoking a cigar, I had some for my supper, which was not a fair test, but I said I would test it fairly in the morning. On the Monday I went to market at half-past four o'clock, and I came to my breakfast at 10 o'clock, and then I was quite certain that it was insipid. Then I gave it to Lee and Nightingale, and they tried it, and they thought it was insipid.

3041. It is rather a favourable sign with regard to American beef, is it not, that it sells in London to-day at 7 *d.* per pound?—I do not think that it is a favourable sign. The market is very bare indeed, and this meat may have come in good condition.

3042. There is no prejudice against American beef?—There is no prejudice against American beef if it comes in good condition.

3043. You said that you were a wholesale and retail butcher?—Yes.

3044. Is there any kind of relation between retail and wholesale prices of meat; if the wholesale price declines does the retail price rise or fall?—They usually take the average; of course if things persistently rise in price we should, as retail butchers, advance the price; but if, on the contrary, it lowers, we lower.

3045. Does not the public generally consider that, if the wholesale price rises, the retail price rises; and that if the wholesale price falls, the retail price remains stationary?—Unfortunately the general public always find out when it gets lower, but they never know anything at all about it when it gets higher.

3046. Is it a mistake on the part of the public to suppose that the retail price does not always follow the wholesale price?—It does to a certain extent.

3047. When English beef is selling wholesale at 8½ *d.* per lb., what does it sell at retail?—It is according to the joint. In London you order perhaps a leg of mutton, and they charge you one price, or you order a neck, and they charge you another price, and so on. With us at Liverpool it is all put into the scale together.

Mr. *Jacob Bright*—continued. Mr. *Hall.*

8 June 1877.

3048. What is the difference between the wholesale and retail price when it is all put into the scale together?—The choice parts are about 2 *d.* per lb. higher.

3049. When this sound American beef is selling at from 2 *d.* to 3 *d.* per lb. wholesale, what would it sell at retail?—It would go into the low neighbourhoods, and they would have to get rid of it, and mess it away as they best could. When I say "sound meat" I mean meat which has escaped siezure by the inspector, but not good meat.

Mr. *Murphy.*

3050. You gave some evidence with regard to the number of American cattle imported, and you said that 1,631 cattle last year, and 1,574 cattle this year, have been imported into Liverpool?—Yes; but the live cattle importation last year only commenced when the St. Lawrence opened.

3051. I think you further stated your opinion to be that there would be 20,000 live cattle imported this year?—Yes; into Liverpool, Glasgow, and London. I think that there would be more than that.

3052. Not into Liverpool alone?—No.

Chairman.

3053. I think I understood you just now to say, in answer to an honourable Member, that there was a short supply in London this morning?—Yes.

3054. And that you did not believe that the American meat was selling in Liverpool at the price that it was stated to be selling at in London?—I do not think it would be.

3055. Would you be surprised to hear that since this morning the last witness has telegraphed to Liverpool for 200 quarters to be sent up to the London market, in consequence of the price here, and that the answer has just come stating that it was all sold in Liverpool at a profit?—Not at 7 *d.* per lb.

3056. That proves that the trade is still in existence in Liverpool and is a paying trade, does it not?—There are four shops in Liverpool still.

3057. However, it proves that the trade is sufficient there at all events to carry off the supply; which is slightly contradictory of your evidence?—It is not for Liverpool alone; it would be distributed throughout the Midland Counties as well as Liverpool.

3058. Your previous statement was that that trade had fallen off?—It has fallen off to a considerable extent.

Mr. JOHN DAVID LINK, called in; and Examined.

Mr. *Torr.*

3059. WHERE do you reside?—I reside at Hackney.

3060. What is your trade?—I am an American Beef Agent and a Provision Merchant.

3061. I believe you have had 25 years' experience in the meat trade in London?—Yes.

3062. Do you import beef on your own account?—I do not.

3063. You receive it on consignment?—Yes, I receive it on consignment from New York.

Mr. *Torr*—continued. Mr. *Link.*

3064. How long have you been in the habit of receiving consignments?—I received the first consignment in October 1875.

3065. And you have continued up to this time?—I have continued up to the present time.

3066. Has the trade increased or decreased?—It has increased.

3067. Have your imports come direct to London?—To Liverpool direct, and from Liverpool to London.

Mr. *Link.*

8 June 1877.

Mr. *Torr*—continued.

3068. Not direct from New York to London by steamer?—No.

3069. Would you state to the Committee in what condition that meat has generally been received here?—From October to December 1875, we received several consignments of a few hundred carcases of beef, which arrived in good order and sold at a fair market price, about 6 *d.* per pound for the carcase, that was about the average during the year 1876. I received about 5,000 tons of American meat from New York direct in weekly shipments, some weeks one vessel, and some weeks two vessels. All arrived in good order, and I never lost one quarter of beef until December 1876, when we lost a few quarters of beef which had fallen from the hooks through rough passages, and where thereby damaged. During the year 1877 we have received English shipments from 500 to 1,000 carcases of beef every week, some vessels bringing as much as 550 carcases besides mutton. The Guion Line bring the larger shipments. The whole of the boats of the White Star Line and Guion Lines bring our beef and mutton to Liverpool, and we supply both lines with the beef at Liverpool for the services of their return passages to New York; and during the whole of that time most of this meat has been purchased by butchers in London and consumed at the west end of London.

3070. What is the highest price that you have obtained for it in London?—To-day we have received nearly 7 *d.* per pound for sides for the meat we received; and during the whole of the time we have never lost one cargo of beef, but a few quarters have been damaged by falling from the hooks.

3071. What is the lowest price that you have ever realised?—In October 1876, when there was a very large supply in the market in very hot weather something like three or four vessels arrived, and the shipments came upon the market, a nd theprice through the great supply ruled very low, and the very lowest price that our meat, although it was in good condition, realised, was about 4 *d.* per pound. I might tell you, if you will allow me, that that in October 1876, on my return from New York, having such large supplies from the States, I sought to supply the provinces; I went to Leeds, Manchester, Liverpool, Birmingham, Wolverhampton, Bristol, and other places, and from that time I placed it upon the markets. In the outset, in those large towns, the butchers evidently had a great prejudice against the meat, and other persons outside the trade started in the meat line to supply the public; and when they opened their shops then the butchers at once began to open their eyes, and they began to inquire for the meat; and from that time the butchers have been increasing their trade in purchasing from us at Liverpool.

3072. That is as to the provincial towns?—That is as to the provincial towns; at the present time a large quantity is being sold in Liverpool every week.

3073. You heard the evidence given by Mr. Gillett, did you not?—I did.

3074. Do you, on the whole, confirm that evidence?—I do.

3075. Is there any one special point that he laid before this Committee that your experience contradicts with reference to the condition of the meat, the quantity supplied, and especially the

Mr. *Torr*—continued.

probability of its continuing to be a steady trade?—The being a resident, and being in the trade, would be better able than I am to answer those questions with reference to the supply; but I believe that he is perfectly correct through what I have learnt from my own shippers.

3076. You look upon it as a fixed trade?—I think the American beef trade is an established fact now; as to the quality, I think that is proved by the large shipments that are being consumed principally, as I have said, by the better class of people, who have been consuming it now for nearly two years, many of them not knowing the difference between that and the best Scotch meat.

3077. I suppose the consignor of this beef does not entrust to you the prices that he pays or the prices that he realises; has he ever let you sufficiently into a knowledge of his business to enable you to say that it is a profitable trade?—I could not answer that question; but the shipments increase, and therefore I infer that he is not losing very considerably.

3078. It has been steadily increasing from the time you entered upon it until the present time?—Yes.

3079. You said that you went to New York, did you not?—Yes.

3080. Therefore you know the arrangements made at New York?—Yes, I saw the whole of the arrangements.

3081. Do you think that those arrangements are capable of being improved?—I think that the process adopted by my shipper is the most successful process, and the only successful process, that has carried the meat so well since October 1875. There are various processes used, but they are not so successful as the one which we use, which is a patent.

3082. Does the meat in any case come in contact with ice?—No, it does not; that is to say, it does not touch the ice; it is kept in a cold, dry temperature.

3083. You said that you sold consignments made by those different lines of steamers; I presume that all your beef is landed at Liverpool, and comes to London by train?—Yes; from Liverpool it is sent to the various provincial towns, and likewise to London.

3084. How is it sent?—By train; we have railway trucks constructed on purpose to hang the meat, and a current of air passes through it as it is on its way to London.

3085. So that the condition of the meat is almost exactly the same as it was on board the steamer?—Say that a White Star boat will be in on Monday; we should commence to discharge her perhaps on Tuesday, and we should continue to discharge her if we had sufficient demand; but if the trade is not sufficiently strong, we supply the meat from our refrigerators during the whole of that week, and it arrives in London nearly as bright at the end of the week as at the time we took it from the refrigerator.

3086. When you take it from the refrigerator to place it in the hands of the retail dealers, how long can you rely upon that meat retaining its soundness?—I hear from the salesmen and the butchers that the American meat will keep longer than any town-killed meat; and it is very reasonable to suppose that it will, because it is so prepared that it would be impossible for that meat

Mr. *Torr*—continued.

meat to decompose for days after the hottest weather that we have here.

3087. Can you speak of that of your own knowledge?—Yes, and from what we see. The meat is chilled right through before it is shipped; if it were not properly chilled, then of course it would not keep; but our experience is that it will keep longer than the town-killed beef.

3088. You of course have very frequently eaten this meat yourself?—Yes, and I sent it to Her Majesty; and John Bright has our meat every week, and the Lord Mayor and the Sheriffs, and the city houses, and the clubs at the West End. They all consume our meat, and pronounce it as being the best.

3089. You heard the last witness say, did you not, that universally there is a complaint made against the American beef of its being soft and too insipid; you do not agree with that statement?—When American beef, or English or Scotch beef, arrives at our market in such a condition that it is perhaps only ready to be cooked, it will not look at all sightly; and very often when it arrives in bad order, Scotch beef will realise no more than American meat.

3090. What is the highest price you have ever known realised for American meat in tip-top condition?—For hind quarters we have realised at some very scarce markets as much as 9 *d.* per lb.

3091. And the retail butchers price would probably be 10 *d.* or 10½ *d.* per lb.?—That I do not know. I am speaking now of very rare cases; but the average prices vary, as Mr. Gillett told you, from 6 *d.* to 6½ *d.*

3092. Do you attach almost imperative importance to the condition in which the meat is shipped at New York?—I do.

3093. On that one point the success of the operation mainly depends?—Yes. There is meat in our market to-day that is in very bad condition, although it is sweet; yet it would not realise but one-third of its value. The surface becomes so mouldy and musty that the price realised is very low. That has happened to-day, I know.

3094. That would be good food for ordinary men, would it not?—Yes; if it were sweet and sound.

3095. Would it be healthy food?—I should say that when the surface was taken off, the meat was sweet. It was sold in our market, and passed by the inspector. This would be only just occasionally when a shipment arrives in bad order.

3096. Have you paid any attention to live stock import?—Not any.

3097. Therefore you could not give us any opinion as to that?—No.

3098. Nor do you know the cost per carcase imported from New York?—It is brought by measurement. I could not tell you exactly what the cost is, but I should think it is between 3 *l.* and 4 *l.* per carcase, or not quite so much, perhaps.

Sir *Rainald Knightley*.

3099. I understood you to say in answer to the honourable Member, that American beef coming through New York would keep longer than English beef fresh from a slaughter-house?—Yes, if the American beef arrives in perfect order, as it should if it is properly prepared before it is shipped, it must keep longer; it is a natural consequence.

Sir *Rainald Knightley*—continued.

3100. Then I imagine from what you say that there is no danger of the supply failing us during the hot months?—There is not. Last summer we carried it every week, and the salesmen said that the American beef was the sweetest meat upon the market.

3101. You have heard Mr. Hall's evidence; it is hardly necessary for me to ask you whether you do or do not concur in his opinion, that the American trade is likely to entirely fail, because it is carried on at a dead loss?—Many of those shops that have been started by men not in the trade are being closed, but the butchers are buying the meat now instead of those men.

3102. Then you do not believe that the American beef trade will fail?—No; because the sales are increasing; they have been increasing up to the present time. I suppose that during the extreme hot weather some of the provincial towns will not take so much as they take in the winter, because they do not eat so much meat.

3103. But the supply will increase again you think as the cold weather comes?—I believe that it will.

Mr. *Norwood*.

3104. As to the rate of cost of 3 *l.* or 4 *l.* per carcase, does that include the cost of ice, or is it merely freight?—I merely speak of freight.

3105. It does not include the cost of the engineer who has to attend to it?—No.

3106. Nor the cost of the erection of the safe?—No, nothing but the freight.

3107. I understand that the cost of erecting the safe is borne by the importer?—Yes.

3108. And of course the ice would add to the cost of the freight?—No doubt.

3109. Has there not been some quantity of meat which you have imported seized in London?—Not of the meat that is consigned to me, it comes through a different process.

3110. Not the meat from your special consignor?—No.

Mr. *John Holms*.

3111. Do you know anything about the trade between Aberdeen and this country in live cattle?—No, I do not.

Colonel *Kingscote*.

3112. Did you hear the last witness say that several tons of meat had been seized and condemned in London during the past week?—Many tons arrived in very bad order from Canada, I think, and Philadelphia.

3113. Can you account for that in any way?—Yes, the ice ran out, I believe, so I am told by a gentleman who was interested in it. They had not sufficient ice; the ice ran out, and consequently the meat began to get musty and mouldy and to decompose. Then the vessel was some days longer than usual, and consequently the meat was without ice for several days.

3114. You heard the last witness also say, that the meat is often soft; do you find that that is so?—In wet weather the meat coming out of a temperature of 38° into a temperature of 60° or 70° will of course naturally give, but after a few hours it will become solid again. That is my experience of our own meat.

3115. Have you in your experience ever heard any complaint that it would not salt?—I have never

Mr. *Link.*

8 June 1877.

Colonel *Kingscote*—continued.

never heard any complaint of that kind as to the meat that we have; it does not apply to the meat that I have consigned to me.

3116. Do you supply any ships?—We supply the White Star Line and the Guion Line with the fresh meat from New York, killed about 13 or 14 days previously, and many of our customers at Liverpool supply other vessels as well with fresh meat which they purchase from us.

3117. That is American beef?—Yes, which is really slaughtered in New York.

3118. It comes over fresh and it is taken back again, and you have no complaints of it?—I have heard of none.

3119. Up to the present time?—Up to the present time.

3120. Has the gentleman in America, for whom you are agent, anything to do with the previous witness, Mr. Gillett?—Not at all; he is sole shipper; he commenced the first successful shipment of 42 carcases, in October 1875, and has continued since to increase his shipments, and I suppose he will still continue if we can sell it.

3121. Are you aware of the quantity of American meat that is brought into the London market in the week?—We are having from 200 to 300 tons a week; that has been about our average since last January; I should think there are now about 500 or 600 tons perhaps, varying from 1,500 carcases to 3,000 (they have reached as much as 3,000 carcases) of beef arriving at Liverpool and Glasgow.

3122. Do you think that what is sold in London during a week would equal one day's consumption of the whole metropolis?—In three months we received 7,000 tons of American beef into the Metropolitan Meat Market, which was brought from Liverpool to London; 10 of the shipments came to Southampton, and one or two to the Victoria Docks by the National Line.

3123. Do you think that that is anything like one-sixth of the consumption of the metropolitan district?—I should think not quite; that would be an exceptionally heavy week when we had 3,000 carcases; but I should think it is perhaps one-tenth on an average.

Mr. *Arthur Peel.*

3124. Are the "Guion" and "White Star" boats that bring your meat passenger ships?—Yes.

3125. Have you ever heard any complaints from passengers on board those ships?—I came back with a cargo of meat on board the ship "Celtic"; I saw the meat slaughtered, and dressed, and put on board, and not the slightest offensive smell could possibly come from it.

3126. It is not possible?—It is not possible, of course, if the appliances of ice and everything else are all right.

3127. Are the chambers sealed hermetically?—The chambers are air-tight, and it is not possible for any smell to come from the meat.

Chairman.

3128. I understand you to say that, dating from this experience in 1875, you can tell this Committee that where it fails in being brought over in a condition fit for the market, it is in consequence of the failure of the process by which it is prepared?—Certainly.

3129. And that it is not in consequence of the

Chairman—continued.

atmospheric influence on it here after it is taken out of the chamber?—Not at all, because we have had meat a fortnight here in London after it has arrived and it has been perfectly sweet.

3130. You have been able to send it from Liverpool to London, taking it out of the atmosphere in which it has come over, and yet it has remained fresh in London?—We commenced discharging our vessel on a Monday, and I have had the meat from the same vessel, from a different chamber, upon our market upon the Saturday following, realising very good prices, and in perfect order.

3131. Then, in fact, you have adopted what was suggested as an improvement by Mr. Gillett, viz., having separate chambers so that you can deal with part of your cargo at a time?—Yes, we always have. When the business increased we required to have two or three chambers for the supply, and I suppose we shall have four chambers to convey the meat in.

3132. After having brought the meat from America in those lines of vessels, you send it back for consumption on board the vessels on their return voyage?—Yes.

3133. And you have not had any diminution of that custom in consequence of complaints of its quality?—We have been supplying both companies here for many months. My son resides in Liverpool; I have three sons there to look after the business, and we have been supplying them for many months, and there have been no complaints. I have eaten the beef myself right through the passage, and I was perfectly satisfied; the beef was very good.

3134. You do not agree with the last witness in saying that the meat has no flavour, and that it spoils?—I could show you letters, as I say, from Her Majesty downwards, approving of the meat, and likewise from customers at the west-end of the town, the butchers who sell the meat. Many of the customers of the butchers have not known really but what they have been eating Scotch meat.

3135. And the shipments have steadily increased during this present year and last year, showing that it has been a remunerative trade?—I do not know as to the remuneration; but evidently it pays, I expect, or else they would not increase the shipments; I hope it is remunerative; sometimes I know they meet with very heavy losses.

3136. Of course, if the losses exceeded the gains, the trade would not have continued to the present moment?—The prices are ruled by the demand and supply, and sometimes our market has three or four times as much as it needs, and then the prices go down.

3137. I suppose, by a system of chambers in which you could maintain the meat at its proper temperature, you would obviate that difficulty?—We, as agents, regulate that as much as we possibly can; we watch all the markets round; we have England to supply, and wherever we can realise the highest price we send the meat.

3138. Therefore you would endorse Mr. Gillett's opinion, that the trade is one which will continue?—I believe that it will continue, and become a very extensive trade indeed.

3139. Were you engaged in the meat trade before this American meat was thought of in 1875?—I had been receiving very large consignments

Chairman—continued.

signments of salted meats from my brothers in New York.

3140. You were not in the live meat trade?—Not at all.

3141. And it was only when this idea first started that you began this new trade?—The first consignment was put into my hands to control.

3142. Have you had any cargoes of meat sent over besides cargoes of beef and mutton?—Yes; we have had several shipments of hogs.

3143. Do they come over in as good order as the beef and mutton?—Just as good. Pork was very low in price at the time, otherwise we should have had large shipments of hogs as well. I believe that we might have any number of hogs from the other side.

Chairman—continued.

3144. You believe that the supply of cattle and pigs from America being almost unlimited, the trade will be a very large one?—Undoubtedly.

Mr. *Assheton.*

3145. You described the vans in which you brought the American meat from Liverpool to London; but you did not tell us whether you used any ice?—We do not; it is not required.

Monday, 11*th June* 1877.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Anderson.
Mr. Assheton.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Cameron of Lochiel.
Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. Chaplin.
Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.
Mr. Elliot.
Mr. W. E. Forster.
Mr. French.
Mr. John Holms.
Mr. King Harman.
Colonel Kingscote.
Mr. Murphy.
Mr. M'Lagan.
Sir Rainald Knightley.
Mr. Norwood.
Mr. Pease.
Mr. Arthur Peel.
Mr. Ritchie.
Sir Henry Selwin Ibbetson.
Mr. Torr.

SIR HENRY SELWIN IBBETSON, IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. ALFRED LYON, called in; and Examined.

Mr. *Lyon.*

11 June 1877.

Chairman.

3146. I BELIEVE you are the Master of the Butchers' Company in London?—I am.

3147. Have you been long in the wholesale meat business?—About 25 years.

3148. For the whole of that time you have been connected with the business in London?—Yes.

3149. I suppose that, in consequence, you have had very considerable experience both in the purchase and slaughter of the foreign cattle that have been introduced?—I have.

3150. You remember the change that took place in the establishment of the Deptford market?—I do.

3151. Can you tell the Committee whether that made any appreciable difference in the introduction of foreign cattle?—I really cannot say of my own knowledge.

3152. But you have found no diminution in the supplies since that market was established?—I think not.

3153. I suppose you would say that the introduction of live cattle from abroad is material to the supply of London?—Very much so, I should say.

3154. Can you tell the Committee what proportion the trade in London use of the foreign supply?—I can hardly say, because buyers come from all parts of the country. When the cattle market is free a great many foreign cattle are taken from the cattle market at Islington all over the country; therefore I can scarcely say what proportion of them will be left in London.

3155. You mean that when foreign countries are unscheduled, and therefore their cattle can go to the Islington market, a certain proportion go from that market to the country?—Yes, to all parts of the country.

3156. But you would still say that the London consumer is dependent, in a great measure, on the foreign imports?—I should say so.

3157. Has your attention been called at all

Chairman—continued.

to the introduction of the American dead meat?—Yes.

3158. Large supplies are being brought into London from that source, are they not?—Very large. I have some statistics here which prove that. The weight of meat which has been brought into the London Metropolitan Meat Market every week for the first 20 weeks of this year is as follows: In the first week of this year there were 264 tons of American dead meat brought into the London market alone, irrespective of that in the provinces; in the second week there were 339 tons; in the third week, 152 tons; in the fourth week, 169 tons; in the fifth week, 133 tons; in the sixth week, 238 tons; in the seventh week, 215 tons; in the eighth week, 124 tons; in the ninth week, 182 tons; in the 10th week, 115 tons; in the 11th week, 197 tons; in the 12th week, 286 tons; in the 13th week, 275 tons; in the 14th week, 405 tons; in the 15th week, 350 tons; in the 16th week, 495 tons; in the 17th week, 417 tons; in the 18th week, 436 tons; in the 19th week, 611 tons; and in the 20th week, 709 tons. That was for the first 20 weeks of this year. I have had this by me some few weeks now. Expecting to give evidence before this Committee, I asked the clerk of the market to be kind enough to give me the weight of meat brought weekly into the market.

3159. That return would bring us down to about the middle of May?—Yes.

3160. Therefore that shows that it has been a steadily increasing quantity that has been put upon the London market?—I do not know that it exactly proves that, because in some of those heavy weeks the meat was in very bad condition, and the provinces would not take it, and the whole of it was sent to London. A great deal of it came in bad condition, whereas, if it had been in good condition, a great deal more of it might have been sold and used in the provinces.

3161. What happened to this large supply of

Chairman—continued.

709 tons that arrived in the last week that you have quoted?—It was in a very mouldy and bad state, and in a very unsaleable condition.

3162. Did it find a sale?—It found a sale; I believe that a very small proportion of that meat was seized.

3163. It was not seized and condemned?—Only a very small proportion of it, but still the greater part of it was in a very mouldy, clammy, and unsaleable state, and realised very little money.

3164. As a question of profit, it was not probably saleable, but it went into the supply of the meat of the town?—Yes. My opinion of the American meat is that it has been one of the greatest boons that it possibly could have been to the butchers and throughout the country.

3165. Supposing that the trade developed itself, and that this meat were delivered in such a condition as the witnesses have stated to the Committee that it is possible to bring it in, that is to say, in such a condition as the best quality of that meat arrives in, it would form, I suppose, a considerable addition to the supply of food in the town?—It would, indeed.

3166. That being the case, do you believe that a system which seems to be possibly successful with regard to the American trade, could be adopted with regard to the foreign meat supply?—I do not.

3167. Will you give the Committee your reasons for that view?—You remember the evidence of the two witnesses who came before you on Friday, Mr. Gillett and Mr. Link, that the American meat which they send is of very good quality; it is a good thick meat, equal to the best English meat; whereas the Continental supply is a very useful article for secondary purposes. The value of the Continental supply consists in this: bringing the cattle alive, having them to hand, and slaughtering them as they are required, and selling them, as I may term it, with the bloom upon them. I may say that if I slaughtered a very good animal on the Monday in cold weather, every portion of it that is left is worth as much on the Saturday; but if I killed three or four Dutch beasts, or Schleswig-Holstein beasts, or beasts from a great many other countries, they are of that thinness and difference in quality that every day they become of less value.

3168. You mean under the same conditions of temperature?—Under the same conditions of temperature. They become drier and more unsaleable; they lose value day by day even here in our own slaughter-houses.

3169. Therefore you believe that because a foreign animal brought over alive will not keep more than a certain time, the same meat, if brought over dead, would not keep in the way that the American meat would keep, which is of better quality?—I believe it would keep perfectly sweet, but it would not be saleable; it would not fetch the same price; it is a different class of meat altogether.

3170. It would not represent the same saleable article which the American meat, from its quality, does?—It would not; I believe the foreigners could not bring the meat here to have it sold at a price which would pay them, and therefore I believe it would ruin their trade.

3171. You say that you believe it would ruin their trade; but with regard to the supply of

Chairman—continued.

the consumers in London, you say that the foreign meat does not keep so great a length of time in proper prime condition after it arrives, and that the American meat, if it is brought over in really good condition, is a saleable article which will keep?—Yes.

3172. Supposing the American trade to develope largely, and the meat to come in good condition, would the consumers suffer then by the prohibition of the live cattle, the meat of which does not keep for any length of time?—If the Americans could send their meat to be sold at a low price, the consumers possibly would not suffer.

3173. The American meat, as I understand, when it is in good condition, fetches 6 *d.* or 7 *d.* per lb.?—It does, in good condition.

3174. And that is meat which, as I understand you to say, you think is a good saleable article?—Yes.

3175. If that supply could be maintained, would it not really satisfy the consumers, even if the foreign supply which at present exists (an inferior article, as I understand you to say, as regards keeping) was done away with?—If it could be fully depended upon; but that is the point, as to whether the American meat can be fully depended upon; because in the case of this supply you are at the mercy of the winds and waves, and perhaps sometimes for days you get no supply, and at other times you get such a quantity put upon the market, that it can hardly be sold, or only at such a price that I am sure it would be far from remunerative to the Americans to send it.

3176. From your experience, has there been any irregularity in the supply in consequence of the weather, or has not the irregularity in the supply rather arisen from the fact that every now and then you get a very much larger amount thrown upon the market from its being sent up, as you described, not in very good condition from the provinces?—I should think that sometimes the ships are detained by the weather, and then a number of ships arrive at one time. That is my impression, but I could not say positively that it is so, from seeing that for some few days there has been no American meat on the market, and then at another time a very great deal more is brought than can be fairly sold.

3177. I think you said that you were present when the two gentlemen gave their evidence on Friday about the trade?—Yes.

3178. They stated that their steamers arrived regularly, and they gave the dates of those arrivals: two a-week in one instance, and one a-week in the other; did you hear that evidence?—I did not hear that, because I should have judged that if the vessels arrived regularly, the supply would have arrived regularly, which it has not done.

3179. You do not think that that may have arisen from the cause which is suggested now, viz: that the supply is occasionally taken up in the ports where it arrives, and that when it is not in very good condition, they may send it up to London and flood the market?—It may have been so; I cannot say of my own knowledge.

3180. I understand you to say that you think the dead meat would not travel so well from the Continent?—I am sure it would not.

3181. That the expense of the animal, increased as it would be by the amount of cost of

Mr. *Lyon*.

11 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

this new apparatus, would be so great as to make it an unprofitable trade to the Continental seller?—I think so.

3182. I suppose that the carriage of the dead meat would be less than the carriage of the live animal?—I believe they are very much better off for ice in America than they are in Schleswig-Holstein, and in those countries, therefore I think the live cattle have the advantage.

3183. You think that those difficulties would raise the price to such an extent that it would not be a profitable trade, but would cease, and that therefore we must be dependent entirely to supply the place of the continental cattle upon a settled American trade upon which you could rely?—That is my impression.

3184. Of course, dealing with cattle plague, that is a disease which every one admits is so dangerous, and of which the danger of importation is so great, that restrictions are absolutely necessary to prevent its introduction?—They are.

3185. I suppose your trade would be very much prejudiced by the cattle plague spreading as it did in 1865?—Very much indeed.

3186. With regard to pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease, do you find from the beasts that come under your inspection, and from your knowledge of the importation of Continental cattle, that those diseases are materially introduced from abroad?—I think not. I have had a great deal of experience of that. I have killed many thousands of Continental cattle, and I never saw a case of lung disease in any one instance except in the Dutch cattle, and then in very few instances in fresh imported cattle.

3187. I suppose that, in the animals affected by pleuro-pneumonia, the probability is that a certain proportion, if not all, of those which are diseased, would be stopped by the inspector before they got into your hands?—They have not arrived here; they might be exported; but I have never seen an instance of it. In fact, I may say the Schleswig-Holstein, the Danish, and the Spanish are very healthy cattle indeed.

3188. Your opinion is that the Schleswig-Holstein cattle are, as has been stated by the witness from that country, free from those diseases?—I never saw healthier cattle, and they keep on our hands for days. Sometimes we may buy them, and if the trade is bad we may not want to kill them until the end of the week, and we give them a little hay and water, and they remain as sound as when we buy them.

3189. And that applies also to the cattle from Denmark and from Spain?—Yes.

3190. Is there a large importation from Spain?—Very large indeed.

3191. Is that a growing importation?—I think it has very much increased lately. In consequence of importations from some countries being prohibited, there has been a very large importation going on from Spain and Portugal.

3192. Have you dealt in cattle which have been brought from the scheduled countries, and which have been killed at Deptford?—I have not.

3193. Therefore your trade in foreign cattle has been principally in cattle in the unscheduled countries coming to the Islington market?—It has.

3194. You mentioned something about having had instances of pleuro-pneumonia in Dutch

Chairman—continued.

cattle; will you state what those instances were?—I have seen a few instances of pleuro-pneumonia in Dutch oxen that have been fed with what we term wash feed; beasts that are fed on hot wash; but I might say that I have never seen more than a dozen cases in many year's experience.

3195. Those beasts come from a country where pleuro-pneumonia exists to a great extent, do they not?—Yes.

3196. And therefore there is a greater risk of its importation from that country, than from the countries that you have previously named?—Possibly.

3197. Have you found that any of the cases of pleuro-pneumonia that have come under your notice have arisen from the home cattle that have been sent to the market?—I believe that pleuro-pneumonia has been very bad in our own country during the last three or four years, it is very bad at the present time.

3198. You think that it is quite as much acclimatised in this country, as it is even on the Continent?—I am sure of it.

3199. In regard to eradicating it, do you believe that we could do without the supply if we restricted the movement of animals throughout the country in the way that has been proposed?—I think not. I think that any measure which will interfere with the food supply of the people will be a very bad measure.

3200. Would that materially interfere with the food supply of the people; because it would be only restricting the movement of cattle in those places, and therefore for a time diminishing, to a certain extent, the supply in the Islington market?—I do not know that it would, but I am of opinion that the lung disease has gained such a hold in this country that it could scarcely be stamped out.

3201. You think that it would be impossible, now that it has got so complete a hold over the country, to get rid of it by any repressive measures?—I am afraid that it would take a very long time.

3202. Are you aware that it has been shown to be possible to eradicate it in those countries abroad with which you deal?—Possibly their climate may be better than that of England. I believe that animals are very much affected by changes of climate, the same as human beings are. I have known instances of lung disease breaking out in a place where there was a number of cattle, one animal has gone with it, and that animal has been immediately slaughtered, and there has not been a case again for years.

3203. Do you think that that was really a case of absolute pleuro-pneumonia?—I am sure of it; I saw the animal killed.

3204. From that you would infer that it is not so infectious as it has been represented to be?—I know it is not. There may be 50 or 60 cows in a London cowshed, and they may lose two or three, and all the others will remain healthy. There are places where it will go right through. There is one place in London now where a man has been losing his cattle for two years past, but I believe that that is in a great measure due to its getting fairly into the place, a diseased animal being sent away, and a fresh animal put into the very place almost immediately. I believe there is not half sufficient care taken in such cases.

3205. Do

Chairman—continued.

3205. Do you consider that the regulations with regard to the inspection of foreign cattle and our own home stock, as against the importation of those diseases, are sufficient for dealing with those diseases?—They ought to be. The cattle are landed at a given point, and they are inspected, and allowed to lie so many hours. If there is a case of disease they are sent to Deptford, and there the whole cargo is slaughtered. There have been some cases of particular hardship in sending cattle to Deptford. During the last 12 months I believe that there have been about three cargoes of milking cows, some of which have been just upon the point of calving, and others have calved; cows I may say worth from 16 *l.* to 28 *l.* a-piece; the whole of the cargo was slaughtered, and obliged to be sent into the market as meat, and there they would not realise possibly more than 8 *l.* or 9 *l.*; whereas if there had been a proper place to quarantine those animals, I believe that the foot-and-mouth disease might have been got over in a very short time, and those animals might have been saved.

3206. Then you would be in favour of adopting a system of quarantine with regard to those store cattle?—Yes.

3207. Do you think that it would be possible to carry out a system of quarantine as regards the Dutch cattle which are imported for dairy purposes?—I believe so; I think the Dutch cows are most invaluable in our country.

3208. As being good milkers?—Yes, and they make capital beef.

3209. You seem to know a good deal about the history of these diseases, and therefore I suppose you are aware that pleuro-pneumonia very often takes a long time before it develops itself in the animal?—Possibly it may.

3210. And therefore there is that difficulty about the inspection at the ports, that whilst an animal may pass the inspection satisfactorily, it may nevertheless become a centre of disease if taken for store purposes?—If store cattle underwent a quarantine of seven or 14 days before they were admitted, surely the disease would have fully developed before that time.

3211. You would meet it in that way, by quarantining store cattle?—Yes, I would; and as for cattle for immediate slaughter, they generally do not mix with anything else that they could infect.

3212. You think that the regulations which at present exist with regard to the fat animals that are imported, are satisfactory?—I think so.

3213. You are aware, are you not, that cattle plague was introduced on the present occasion from some defect in those regulations?—Yes; that was rather an unfortunate circumstance, but I believe that it was a grievous mistake on the part of the Corporation of London not to deal more vigorously than they did with those cattle at the time. Although Professor Brown ordered them to be destroyed early the next morning, they were eight days getting rid of them.

3214. You mean to say, that after the order had gone out for their slaughter, a period of eight days elapsed?—A period of eight days elapsed before they were entirely destroyed, and during that time a large number of those cattle died.

3215. But during that time, I suppose, that the place where they were confined was an infected district, and all ingress to, and egress from it, was prevented?—After Professor Brown saw them; but I believe that during the hours after their arrival, before Professor Brown had condemned them, several people saw them.

3216. And in that way the disease might have been carried?—The disease might have been carried by drovers.

3217. But subsequently to the knowledge having come to the department of cattle plague having broken out, although there may have been delay in the absolute slaughter, there was no negligence, was there, in preventing the spread of the disease?—I do not think that it was negligence; I think it came upon them when they were unprepared for anything of the sort. They did not expect a cargo of animals coming in such a diseased state, and I think that stronger measures might have been taken. I have seen many cattle suffering with cattle plague; their breathing is dreadfully hard, and every time they breathe I believe they are poisoning the atmosphere. If I had had to deal with this large number of cattle, I think I should have got a number of navvies and dug a tremendous trench, and killed all the animals and put them in, and covered them up with quick-lime. I think that would have been far better than having the animals there day after day poisoning the air with their breath, because there was such a number to deal with, for the small staff and the condenser which they had at their disposal.

3218. You would be in favour of the system which is adopted in Germany, of always burying diseased animals at once on the spot, wherever it may be?—I think that where the animals are so diseased you could not have too strong restrictions. With regard to the cattle at Limehouse, I happen to have butchered a good many cows for the man on whose premises the disease was first found to exist. I heard that he had 11 cows ill on his premises, and I went down to see what was amiss, and I came to the conclusion immediately that it was a case of cattle plague by the appearance of the animals. Notice was given to the Privy Council to that effect, and during the next 24 hours seven of those animals died. Then they were all removed away to the knackers.

3219. Were any precautions taken with regard to disinfecting people who went near those cattle?—I do not know whether that precaution was taken on the next day, but it was not taken at first. I took particular care myself, and I told the cow-keeper to be careful not to go near any other men who had cattle, and to shut up his own place and not to let anyone go into it.

3220. What would you suggest in order to strengthen our present regulations so as to protect us from such a state of things in the future?—If a cargo of diseased cattle arrived at Deptford, if the disease were in a very early stage, I do not know what they could do more than they did under the circumstances. Mr. Philcox, the superintendent, came to the conclusion in his own mind that those cattle were suffering from cattle plague, and he put them in a place by themselves; but the doctor, on the other hand, I believe, at first almost doubted its being cattle plague; and until Professor Brown saw the beasts the next morning, it was not finally decided that it was a case of cattle plague. The drovers went in amongst the cattle; but still I think that, under any circumstances, if a

Mr. *Lyon*.

11 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

cargo of cattle is landed and they are ill from any cause, it would be best to shut them up and keep them apart.

3221. All that proves the danger of allowing import altogether, because until the disease is pronounced to be cattle plague people are constantly in contact with the beasts?—Yes; but, on the other hand, the Germans say that it was a mistake to let those beasts come across the country; and if they take the measures which they promise to take, in all probability such a case might not occur again, and I trust it may not.

3222. Do you think that the precautions which may be taken by foreign countries in concert with ourselves, and a little more strictness on the part of our own officials, would render a similar case impossible?—I think so; I think it is to the interest of continental countries to stamp out the disease, and to prevent its coming here, because it is most material to them for us to take their cattle.

3223. I suppose from that that you would tell the Committee that, in your opinion, the only countries that should be treated as scheduled countries should be countries where there was evidence either of there being cattle plague, or of there being a probability of its breaking out?—Yes.

3224. And you think that the other countries should be dealt with, as they are at present dealt with, as unscheduled countries?—I think so.

3225. Did I correctly understand you to say that you think in any case of disease in which there were symptoms of cattle plague, the whole cargo should be immediately destroyed and buried?—Yes; I believe that all this cargo of cattle had the plague, and it was not a case in which there were a few out of the whole number infected.

3226. How would you deal with a herd supposing that cattle plague spread from the port, as in this instance, and broke out in a herd of cattle as it did at Willesden; would you in a case like that destroy all the cattle that were in the yard?—I do not think that it would be safe to leave any alive.

3227. You mean that, whilst destroying and burying the diseased cattle, you would kill and dress on the place, and send into the market for food those that were not affected?—Yes; if they were not affected, and the meat was good.

3228. To summarise your evidence, you believe that whilst cattle plague, if it is introduced, would be very destructive, the last introduction might have been prevented by better restrictions, which probably will be adopted in future; and that there is nothing in that to alarm the country to such a degree as to render it necessary to prevent the import of live cattle from the countries where it can be shown that the disease does not exist?—I think not; I think that people on the Continent have learnt a very good lesson, and I think that we have learnt a very good lesson also.

3229. At the same time you admit that the consumer is not so entirely dependent upon the foreign supply as he was in consequence of the possibility of the establishment of an American dead-meat trade?—Certainly not.

3230. Up to the present time the importation of dead meat has consisted of the meat alone, and offal has not been imported?—Offal has not been imported.

Chairman—continued.

3231. A very large number of people in the East of London depend very much, do they not, upon that article of food?—They do; offal is very largely sold there.

3232. Would the price of American meat, as it is imported, in any way meet the difficulty of doing away with the supply of offal which those people now get from the foreign cattle?—If it decreased the number of cattle killed in this country, in London, it would not meet the difficulty.

3233. But I suppose that these consumers take the offal on account of its price?—A great many poor people live a great deal on the offal; they can go to a butcher's shop, and they can buy a bullock's heart, or sweet breads, and other things.

3234. On account of the price being less?—Yes; they come cheaper than meat.

3235. American meat comes very much cheaper into the market than English meat, does it not?—It has done up to the present time; but if I were asked my opinion, from the experience that I have had of the price that the American meat has made, the gentlemen say that it cannot be remunerative unless they can make about 6½*d.* a lb. of it; if it be so, I would say that up to the present time the American meat that has come to London must have lost many thousands of pounds, because I am satisfied that it has realised nothing of the sort.

3236. But I understand you to say that the explanation of that is, that the American meat which has fetched those lower prices has been meat which has not come in a very good order?—A great deal has come to London in very good order, and has realised a very high price; a very fairly good price.

3237. Supposing the condition of the trade to be so changed that experience enables them to bring the American meat all over in fair condition, it will fetch that price, I suppose?—I should think so, unless there was too much on the market. Of course supply and demand rule the price.

3238. Taking it that 6*d.* or 6½*d.* per pound is the price at which it sells, would that price place it within the reach of the customers who, from the high price of English meat, principally consume the offal?—It might do so in a measure; but the question is, whether, if the London trade were thrown more into the hands of the Americans, the price, with greater exports from America, would not go up there, so that they could not afford to sell the meat so cheaply. Any trade we know, if it is to be carried on, must be made remunerative, and unless the Americans can make it fairly remunerative, they cannot carry it on. I know that it would be a great boon to the poor population, and to the butchers, if it could be brought, because, during the last few years, Scotch beef has got to an almost fabulous price; it has got to a famine price, and this good American meat very materially assists the butcher in his trade.

3239. Is a large portion of the population dependent on the offal of the slaughtered foreign cattle, because, of course, there is always offal from the slaughtered English cattle?—Yes, the offal of all cattle always meets with a ready sale.

3240. The last examination before this Committee really pointed to the fact that a large part

Chairman—continued.

part of the population would be in want of food if the offal from the foreign cattle was not in the market; that condition is to a certain extent altered by the price of American meat, is it not?—It has been lately.

3241. It has been stated by Professor Brown, that the offal is brought from abroad over here and sent to the towns in the country; has that come under your notice?—I have never known a single instance of it, and I think that that is a mistake.

3242. From the condition in which it travels, do you think that it would be possible?—I do not think that offal could be preserved in the manner that meat is preserved, and I do not think that it would be sent.

3243. You do not think that it could be brought over from America by the same system that the meat is brought by?—I think not; take the tripe of an animal, for instance, the value consists in its freshness; it is cooked and sold almost immediately. In the summer time, and in the back end of the year, when the tripe-men have more than they can sell, if they salt it or keep it in any way, when they bring it out for sale again I know it is not so saleable.

3244. Is there anything else that you wish to put before the Committee in your examination-in-chief?—I think not.

Mr. *Chaplin.*

3245. I understand that you think there must have been a heavy loss so far upon the American dead meat trade?—Yes.

3246. What do you imagine has been the average price throughout of that which has been imported?—There has been a good deal seized altogether and lost entirely. One day last week there were 12 tons seized, and another day there were six tons seized. Therefore that was an entire loss, and I know a case of a heavy lot of meat where 200 quarters of beef were sold at 1 *d.* per pound. The meat during that week was on costermongers' barrows, being sold in all parts of the town at anything they could get for it. I should think, from a calculation which was made at the time, that upon the American meat that came to London that week, there could not have been a loss of less than 20,000 *l.*

3247. Do you know to what cargo that 12 tons of which you spoke as having been seized belonged?—I do not.

3248. Do you know when it arrived?—It arrived. I think on Wednesday and Thursday last week. On one day the inspectors told me that they had seized 12 tons, and another day 6 tons.

3249. What is the average price at which beef which is imported alive from the Continent comes into the English market?—I should think that plenty of live bullocks have been sold in the Smithfield-market at fully 6 *s.* a stone as they stood.

3250. How much would that be per lb.?—Ninepence per lb.

3251. Is that the average price at which the beef which is imported from the Continent alive generally comes into the English market?—All the continental beasts would not make so much as that. The American beasts that have come alive have been generally a very good class almost equal to an English bullock.

Mr. *Chaplin*—continued.

3252. What would be the average price in the English market of the beef which is imported from the Continent alive?—I should think that perhaps 8 *d.* per lb. as it stood; in some instances a little more; but it is not such good beef as the American beef.

3253. I understand you say that in your opinion it would pay the Americans well to sell their meat at 6½ *d.* per lb.?—They say so.

3254. What is you opinion about it?—In my opinion, as regards the class of beef of which you have been speaking, which has been equal to the best English beef, it must be a fine country, and they can produce the beef much cheaper than we can in England, if they can afford to sell it so. I have only their word for it.

3255. I suppose the best proof of that would be the price at which they do sell at?—When it gets here it is obliged to be sold; meat is an article which you cannot keep.

3256. I suppose that, unless it paid them, they would not continue to send it?—It remains to be proved whether they will keep on. There are some companies going, and perhaps when they make up their accounts they may not be satisfactory.

3257. Have you seen any of the American beef that has been imported alive from America?—Yes.

3258. What is your opinion of that?—I have seen some cargoes that have come where the beasts have been very much worn by the journey. I have seen beasts lying on their sides so fatigued that they have had to be killed in the market.

3259. Were they in very bad condition?—They were regularly fatigued; nearly dead with the fatigue of the journey and from the sea-sickness, I should think. On the other hand, when they have had a good passage, I have seen them come as fresh as larks.

Mr. *Arthur Peel.*

3260. You gave us 20 weeks' import of meat into the London market; did that include the supply from the provinces?—No; that was only that which came into the London Central Meat Market.

3261. Where did it come from?—From America.

3262. What strikes one in that list is the immense fluctuations, dropping one-half in two consecutive weeks; how do you account for that; did any of this meat come from the provinces?—Most of it came from Liverpool, and was sent on to London.

3263. For instance, in the second week, it was 339 tons, and in the third week it dropped to 152 tons; what would be the explanation of that sudden drop?—Possibly the meat was in good condition, and was bought in Liverpool to go to Manchester, Sheffield, and other places.

3264. I suppose the prices have fluctuated in the same proportion?—Yes; if the meat is in good condition, there is a good trade for it. I believe it might be brought in far better condition than it is, but I think they overpack and bring too much. In some cargoes I have heard of their bringing over 3,000 quarters of beef, whereas if they brought half that quantity, I think they might bring it all in good condition; but that is, of course, a matter for themselves. I

Mr. *Lyon.*

11 June 1877.

Mr. *Arthur Peel*—continued.

think that much of this meat has been spoiled by bringing too much meat in a ship.

3265. Not by sending more meat than we could consume in this country?—No; because I do not know what the price of beef would have been with a regulation shutting out the import from Germany, if it had not been for the American meat imported into this country. I say that it has been of the greatest advantage to this country to have the American meat.

3266. Do you agree with the statement of Mr. Hall, the wholesale Liverpool butcher, that he believed that the American dead-meat trade has fallen off in every town but London?—I believe that when it comes in very bad condition they cannot do with it in the provinces, because some of it looks as if it were covered with a coat of verdigris all over. It has to be washed all over with hot soda and water, and a great deal of it has to be trimmed off, and in the provincial towns they will not have their meat in that state. If you offered a joint of that to a collier, for instance, he would very likely throw it out of doors; whereas in London the poor people get the butchers to trim it up, and when the outer surface is taken off it is very good meat, and it can be sold at a low price.

3267. What is its appearance when it is trimmed?—The appearance is very good.

3268. It has no bloom on it, I suppose?—No; it looks dull from the time it has been killed. All meat which has been killed for a length of time will lose its bloom

3269. But it is sound and good meat?—It is perfectly sound and good meat.

3270. Did I correctly understand you to say that the foreign live stock imported into this country is not of first-rate quality?—It is not. The Americans have acted wisely; they have come here and got some of our best animals, and bred from them and improved their stock. I believe that the American stock is nearly as good as the English, whereas the German and Swedish cattle, and the cattle from some other countries, are a great ungainly bullock, with almost as much bone as meat upon it.

3271. And therefore the American dead-meat trade will represent a better quality of meat than the Continental live meat trade?—A far better quality; the nicest quality of meat from the Continent is the Danish and the Schleswig-Holstein meat.

3272. Why should not Schleswig-Holstein send over the best meat in the shape of dead meat; you say that they are worse off for ice than America, but they are close to Norway?—I have heard them say that ice is dear in Schleswig-Holstein.

3273. You are of opinion that pleuro-pneumonia is acclimatised in this country?—That is my impression.

3274. What regulations would you establish to prevent the possibility of pleuro-pneumonia being imported from abroad; would you propose to do it simply by establishing a quarantine?—For store stock, I should. I believe that some animals will take the disease, and some will not take it; it is just the same as it was with the cattle plague. In 1865, I knew two cases in which we had the cattle plague, and some did not take it. There was a cow-keeper in Southwark named Adams, who had three cows which stood

Mr. *Arthur Peel*—continued.

through it. Before the nature of the disease was known he lost 183 beasts; and those three cows stood right through the disease and never took it, and they got fat afterwards, and I killed them.

3275. You seem to recommend more stringent regulations against the foreign import than against home cattle; what preventitive measures would you adopt with regard to home and foreign cattle suffering from pleuro-pneumonia?—I believe that if an animal is affected with pleuro-pneumonia, the sooner it is killed the better. I do not know that one animal in 500 would get over pleuro-pneumonia, and if it did I do not think it would be of much use afterwards. I have killed animals which have had pleuro-pneumonia and have got over it, and the lung has been like a lump of stone, perfectly dead and heavy.

3276. What would you do with cattle in the provinces or in London, in the neighbourhood of which pleuro-pneumonia is discovered?—I would let it go on. I do not think that pleuro-pneumonia is so infectious that it is necessary to have any such stringent measures with regard to it as are necessary in the case of cattle plague.

3277. Then why are you so anxious to kill them?—Because I belive that if an animal has lung disease it will never do any good, and possibly it might poison others with which it came in contact; but I believe that the best plan is to kill it at once, if it has decidedly pleuro-pneumonia.

3278. Not for the sake of the others?—Not without the others took it; I should not kill the others on account of their having been in contact with it.

Colonel *Kingscote.*

3279. I conclude that your veterinary knowledge is derived from experience, and that you have never studied veterinary science?—No, I have had great experience in the trade. I may say that I have killed something like 500 cows a year out of the London cow-sheds.

3280. Do you find that there is a great deal of pleuro-pneumonia in the London cow-sheds?—There is always pleuro-pneumonia in the London cow-sheds, but I do not believe that it exists to a greater extent there than in other places. I believe that wherever there are cow-sheds in any place, there pleuro-pneumonia would exist at times.

3281. You say that you have killed a great many cattle from the London dairies; were those healthy cattle?—Healthy cattle; fat cattle generally.

3282. But you have killed a good many that were not healthy, I suppose?—I have had a great many sent to me that were not healthy.

3283. Have you killed any suffering from pleuro-pneumonia?—I have killed some suffering from pleuro-pneumonia, and occasionally from foot-and-mouth disease.

3284. Do you think that the London dairies are a great hotbed of pleuro-pneumonia?—I do not, not more so than other places. There is a place on Wanstead Flats now, a nice open country, where cattle ought to be healthy; but one man has had pleuro-pneumonia there for some time, and his things have been under restrictions now for some months.

Colonel *Kingscote*—continued.

3285. You say that you would not kill any animals that were alongside beasts infected with pleuro-pneumonia, but that you would only kill those that were infected?—I would only kill those that were infected.

3286. Are you aware that the disease is said to go on haunting a place?—I think the wisest plan, if it haunts a place, would be to clean the place well, and strip it, and put it under better conditions. A place may be very draughty, and liable to give animals pleuro-pneumonia.

3287. I think you said that, as a general rule, you have not found pleuro-pneumonia in foreign animals; from what countries have those cattle come in which you have found pleuro-pneumonia?—In the Dutch beasts fed on hot wash.

3288. But you have never found it in cattle from Schleswig-Holstein?—I have never seen a case in animals from there.

3289. Do you not think that pleuro-pneumonia might very easily be brought over by the store cattle that come?—Some might possibly have it.

3290. Are you aware that it is a long time lying dormant in a beast before it develops itself?—I cannot say. It tells very much upon the breath of an animal. I should think it is not long before it can be discovered.

3291. You are not aware that veterinary surgeons tell us that it sometimes lies dormant, or, at least, is not to be detected for two or three weeks?—I should hardly believe in veterinary science if it said so.

3292. I think you said that you have not had any personal experience in the dead-meat trade from the Continent?—Yes; a few years ago, when there was a stoppage of cattle, a good deal of meat was killed in Belgium and Germany and sent over dead.

3293. Did it come over in a good state or in a bad state?—It did not make anything like what it would have made if it had come over alive.

3294. Do you see any reason why dead meat which is killed on the Continent, under the same circumstances as the American meat, should not come over here in just as good condition as the American does?—It might be as sound, but it would not be so saleable, because the meat would not be so good.

3295. Do you know any reason why either thinner meat or fatter meat should not be killed and preserved in the same way?—Thin meat would not be so saleable. We generally kill those cattle one day and sell them the next while the bloom is on them; but every day that we kept them, as I have already said, they would become of less value.

3296. Can you give the Committee any idea of the lowest price that it would pay the Continental importer for the meat to be sold at here?—I could not.

3297. Do you think that they could afford to sell it here at 6½ *d.* per lb.?—I am sure that the Continental meat would not make anything of the sort.

3298. Do you mean alive or dead?—It would alive but not dead.

3299. You said, I think, that they would fetch something like 8 *d.* per lb. alive?—I should think on Smithfield stones to-day, good fat foreign cows are making about 8 *d.* per lb. as they stand.

Colonel *Kingscote*—continued.

3300. And you think that that pays?—I believe so.

3301. But if it were brought over as dead meat, you think that it would hot pay them?—I believe not.

3302. What is the weight of a Smithfield stone?—Eight pounds. There is this great advantage in New York; there they can get rid of all their offal, as Mr. Gillet said, and sell it well; but in Schlewig-Holstein there is a very small population, and if the cattle were killed there, the offal would have to come here, and it could not be brought in saleable condition, and I believe that that would result in a great loss.

3303. If you go on importing animals from the Continent, as you are doing now, is there not great danger of the recurrence of an outbreak of cattle plague?—There cannot be any danger at the present time, because we are only importing from countries where cattle plague does not exist and has never existed, unless they should have the misfortune to have it imported. That was the case in Germany, and they soon stamped it out. With regard to Russia, where cattle plague has always existed, I think that this country ought always to shut their cattle out. With regard to Germany, if they allow their cattle to become a source of danger to England, I think we ought to shut them out also; but if they will take every precaution to send their cattle here in a healthy state, I think that it is a bad thing for this country to limit the supply.

Mr. *Anderson.*

3304. Is it only as regards cattle plague that you wish the regulations to apply?—That is so.

3305. Not to pleuro-pneumonia, and not to foot-and-mouth disease?—With regard to pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease, the beasts affected with those diseases undergo a certain quarantine when they come in, which I think is sufficient, because in plenty of cargoes where there has been only one case of disease found, the whole cargo has been sent to Deptford and killed.

3306. The general result of your opinion is that you consider the American dead-meat trade a very valuable adjunct to your trade?—Yes, very valuable indeed.

3307. But you do not consider that it possibly can be a complete substitute for the live-meat trade?—I do not believe that it ever can be a complete substitute for the live-meat trade.

Mr. *John Holms.*

3308. I think you spoke of the great fluctuations in the importations of American meat to London as arising from the fact that the provinces in many instances could not, or would not, take it?—They would not take it if it was in bad condition.

3309. Therefore the only true test of the quantity of American meat arriving in this country is the quantity arriving at the ports, and not the quantity sold in London?—Yes.

3310. Did you mean by the loss of 20,000 *l.*, to which you referred, the value of the meat which was actually destroyed, or did you mean that you believe that the whole transaction with regard to that

Mr. *Lyon.*

11 June 1877.

Mr. *John Holms*—continued.

meat would represent a loss of 20,000*l.*?—I believe that from the great sacrifice at which the meat was sold in the London market a loss of 20,000*l.* was incurred in that one week; everything was brought down to the very lowest ebb; you might say that there was a great deal more meat in the market than was required, and the American meat was in bad condition, and the butchers bought it at a very low price. I have a ticket here: 266 stone of good sound meat sold on the 1st of June at 1*s.* 8*d.* per stone.

3311. What might the consumers pay for it?—The meat came in such gluts at the time that it was sold on costermonger's barrows. Men got vans and horses, and took it down to the Victoria Docks and other parts, and took it into Romford Market, and to all the places to sell it cheap, and they were selling the best joints for 4*d.* per lb., or anything that they could get for it; if they had not done so the meat would have spoiled and come to nothing.

3312. You said that the loss to the poorer classes, especially in the East of London, is very great in respect to the offal which does not come in the case of dead meat; what is the average weight of offal that would be food for the people that would come out of an average-sized bullock?—I have never gone into the weight, but a good fair bullock's heart generally weighs from 7 to 8 lbs. Then there is the tail, and the kidneys, and the skirt, which would weigh possibly 4 lbs. Then the head, of course, is very valuable, and the tripe is very good food when it is properly prepared; and there is the sweetbread, and those little things that are sold as they come hot, you may say, out of the slaughter-house; but I could not give the weight.

3313. You say that in some cases cattle that come by sea, or by railway, are so fatigued that they have to be killed almost immediately; in such cases does not that mean a considerable reduction of flesh meat to the consumer?—I was speaking then of the American beasts that I have seen. The continental cattle are not so long on the journey; they are, perhaps, two days, where the others would be 16 days.

3314. You have had experience both of the continental live cattle trade, and also, I think you said, of the Aberdeen trade; would you say that there was any appreciable reduction of the flesh meat which would practically go to the consumer by the cattle being carried alive, and then being killed here?—There would be in many instances.

3315. Would you say that there was any appreciable amount of decrease of weight?—Some cattle will keep themselves better than others; it all depends upon the state the animal is in. The American beasts are well cared for on their journey, and they come to hand generally in very good condition. Of course, if they have a very rough voyage, they would suffer the same as a human being from sickness and tossing about, and, therefore, they would become ill and lose flesh.

3316. Could you say what per-centage they would lose upon a bad voyage?—No, I could not.

3317. Whatever they did lose in weight would be chiefly in fat, and not in flesh, I suppose?—I believe they lose in both ways.

Mr. *French.*

3318. With regard to these beasts that you say you saw suffering after coming from America, did that affect the meat besides affecting the weight?—The meat would not be in very first-rate condition.

3319. It would not keep so long?—No.

3320. You say that you have seen a good many beasts killed that have been suffering from pleuro-pneumonia; could you tell the Committee about what time a beast may be suffering from the disease before it makes the meat bad?—No, I could not; I have seen them in all stages of the disease. There was a case, last Saturday, where an animal was killed that the inspector condemned; the disease had made inroads into the flesh of the ribs, and therefore he condemned it; but, in the first stage, if the lung had not adhered to the ribs in a manner to strike into the meat, the meat would be good. I should have no objection to eating such meat, and I do not believe that any harm would come from it; but I believe that if the animal is in an advanced stage of the disease, and the lungs adhere to the ribs, and inflammation gets into the meat, then the animal is unfit for food.

3321. With regard to cattle from the Continent, you say that they are not in nearly such good condition as the American meat generally?—A good many of them may be in a good condition, but they are not such a good class of bullock. They are an unwieldy bullock, and a good many of them are very big boned beasts, and they have not the quantity of flesh upon them. The Continental breeders have not studied their breed so much as the Americans have.

3322. I understood you to say that there was not so much fat about them?—There is not so much fat about them generally.

3323. Then, in case they could establish this dead-meat trade, if they arrived in any kind of bad condition, would they be able to stand the dressing, or paring, which the American meat gets?—No, it would be very thin. If the continental meat came in the same condition as the American meat does, it would realise next to nothing, but it would not be so long on the journey. In cold weather it would keep without any preparation.

3324. Have you seen any of the ships in which the meat has come?—I have not.

Mr. *Norwood.*

3325. With reference to the importation of dead meat from the Continent, your belief is based, first, upon the quality of the Continental cattle not being up to the mark, and, secondly, upon the facility of obtaining ice not being so great as it is in America?—They say so.

3326. Have you gone into the question of freight?—I have not.

3327. Are you aware that the freight of live cattle, from Hamburg, for instance, or from Holland, is extremely small, being only about 1*l.* per head?—I believe it is very small.

3328. Whereas the freight on a live beast from America would be about 5*l.* or 6*l.*?—More than that; it would be about 7*l.*, I believe.

3329. Have you taken into consideration that the cost per carcase of bringing over dead meat would be almost as great from Hamburg, or from Holland,

Mr. *Norwood*—continued.

Holland, as it would be from New York?—I have not heard.

3330. The refrigerating safe which they erect on board the ship must be the same, must it not?—Yes.

3331. And therefore it would cost as much to convey the carcases from Hamburg as from New York, as far as the safe was concerned?—The foreigner would first have to pay a royalty on the patent before he could use it.

3332. Then there would be the erection, and then there would be the ice and the attendants?—Yes.

3333. Then, on the other hand, the shortness of the time would have to be considered, which would be a set-off; but can you tell the Committee whether or not it is the fact that the cost of bringing the dead meat in refrigerators would be very much greater in proportion from the near port than from the distant port?—I do not know of my own knowledge.

3334. But you are aware that the cost of conveying the live animals is very small indeed from the Continent, being perhaps about one-fifth only of the cost of conveying them from America?—It is very small; less than that, I believe.

3335. But you would be glad to see all the good meat that could come here in good condition?—I should.

3336. You have no doubt that the importation of dead meat will be better regulated than it has been when everyone becomes better acquainted with it; for instance, from America the glut will not take place to the same extent as before, but they will regulate their shipments?—Time will prove that.

3337. And you are very glad to get all that dead meat, but you would be very sorry to see the exclusion of the live continental meat?—Very. A great many of the foreign animals are sold to Government contractors who are obliged to send in live cattle. To Aldershot, to Chatham, to Portsmouth, and to a great many of the large Government contracts they only take live cattle. At the price at which the contracts are taken they could not afford to send first-rate English beasts; and these good useful cattle, Spanish, Tonning, Schleswig-Holstein, and some few Swedish cattle are sent to supply those contracts; whereas, if the meat came dead into the London market they could not send that meat at all.

3338. And if cattle come alive you can keep them in case of a glut?—Yes, we can regulate the trade much better by having the animals brought in alive than if they are brought in dead.

Mr. *Cameron*, of Lochiel.

3339. Do many of the butchers in London sell this American meat now?—I believe it is sold almost all over London. There are some few butchers who do not use it, but I believe that most of them do.

3340. Is it their practice to draw a distinction in selling their meat between American meat and English meat, or do they let their customers find it out for themselves?—Some customers ask for it, and I believe if they do they can be supplied with it; but I believe that in some instances, if they do not ask for it, they are as likely to get American meat as English.

Mr. *Cameron*, of Lochiel—continued.

3341. At the same prices?—At the same prices, because if it is good it is worth the same price. I am quite satisfied that before the American meat was imported the price of Scotch meat had got to such an extreme height that the butcher would hardly know how to put a knife into it to bring the money again.

3342. Is Scotch beef considered much more valuable than English beef?—It has been.

3343. To what extent retailed per pound?—Some of the West-end butchers got into the way of cutting the Scotch beef, and they fancied that they could cut nothing else until they got the American beef.

3344. Does the same thing hold good with regard to Scotch sheep?—I believe so. I heard last Friday that hind-quarters and fore-ribs of beef were being sold in the London market at 11½ *d.* per pound. I think a butcher is a clever man to get anything out of that.

Mr. *Chamberlain.*

3345. Has the importation of American meat had any effect in lowering the price of English meat?—It has a little.

3346. Do you think that the regulations of the Cattle Plague Act are better carried out by the Privy Council than by the local authorities?—I think they were at the finish. I think the great mistake which was made by the local authorities was when the cattle plague was at the east of London, in only having one officer for the whole of the east and north of London. There were a great many miles to travel over, and before the prohibition was put upon the sheds I believe that a great many removals took place from those places where the disease was which tended to spread it.

3347. You do not think that the regulations which have been imposed by the Privy Council have been unnecessarily strict?—I think not; where rinderpest exists I do not think that the regulations can be too strict.

3348. Have you had any experience of the action of the local authorities outside the metropolis?—At Stratford I have.

3349. But not generally in the country?—No. One or two cases occurred at Stratford, and they drew a cordon of a mile round the place, and would not allow anything to be moved either into or out of it; and therefore they closed with it, as it were, at once.

3350. Do you know anything of the condition of the cowsheds and lairs in London?—I believe that the cowsheds may be very considerably improved.

3351. Do you think that their present condition is a cause of disease?—I should think very possibly that it may be in some instances through overcrowding.

3352. Do you see any objection to putting them under the control of the local authorities, in the same way as the slaughter-houses are?—None at all; I think that is what ought to be done.

Mr. *King Harman.*

3353. Have you ever heard of American meat being sent to Aberdeen and re-imported into London as Scotch beef?—I have heard of its being sent to Glasgow, and then, if it has failed

Mr. *Lyon.*

11 June 1877.

Mr. *King Harman*—continued.

to make a sale there, of its being sent on to London for sale; but anyone can tell American beef from Scotch beef.

3354. Any butcher could, but could any average housekeeper?—I do not know that the average housekeeper could; but if it has been sent from Glasgow to London, it has been sent, I should think, into the London central market. Sometimes, I believe, cargoes have been sent to Glasgow that have failed to meet a demand there, and in consequence they have been sent on here.

3355. And they have commanded a good price in London?—It has all depended upon the condition in which it has come. You never can sell meat that comes in a bad condition at a good price.

3356. Have you any idea of the number of live cattle that are imported into this country as compared with the consumption in the country?—I believe it is about one-sixth.

3357. What do you say is the proportion of the consumption in the metropolitan market?—I could not say; the supply varies very much there.

3358. You say that the foreign beef would not keep as well as the American beef; that is in consequence of its difference in texture and fibre, I suppose?—Yes.

3359. The Spanish beef is a very coarse beef, I believe, with a white fibre?—The Spanish beef is a good thick class of bullock, but they are not good eating bullocks; they are a long way from what you would call a first-class bullock.

3360. Is not a great deal of American beef the meat of Texan cattle?—I do not know; I know that it is of very good quality, come from wherever it may.

3361. How long will the American beef keep in average cold weather after it has been taken out of the refrigerators?—I believe it would keep until the weather comes hot again. I have known meat hung up in our market for an experiment, and it hung there for 11 weeks in moderately cold weather, and it was perfectly sound at the expiration of that time. That was a piece of American meat. I believe that the animal heat is so thoroughly got rid of when it is preserved well, that it will keep for a very long time.

3362. You say that foreign cattle were selling in the market this morning at about 8*d.* per pound as they stood; is that including the offal?—Yes; but there are plenty of good Danish cattle that have realised more than that. I should think that it would fetch 5*s.* 8*d.* per stone; I said 8*d.* per pound with respect to good fat cows.

3363. The plan that you suggested for preventing disease spreading is by means of quarantine; if there were five or six cargoes of suspected beasts you would require a separate quarantining yard for each lot, would you not?—Yes.

3364. Then you would have to disinfect that?—Yes. I think that if cattle were coming for quarantine they might be detained very much lower down the river, somewhere on the coast of Essex. I think that it would be a very good plan for the vessels with foreign cattle on board to be boarded, the same as they are by the Customs officers, a good way down the river, to see whether any disease exists. If an officer had gone on board the "Castor," say down at the Nore, he would have found these cattle in a bad state there, and they might have been sent back again at once.

Mr. *King Harman*—continued.

3365. But supposing that they had been kept in quarantine, would you suggest that the vessel should be kept in quarantine?—If it was proved to be cattle plague, I should. The vessel ought not to go unless it was thoroughly disinfected.

Mr. *Elliot.*

3366. Did you not say just now that the total amount of foreign cattle consumed in this country was one-sixth of the whole consumption?—I have heard so; I cannot state it of my own experience.

3367. Do you not mean that it is 6 per cent. of the whole consumption?—I understood it to be about one-sixth.

Chairman.

3368. Does that refer to the metropolis or to the whole country?—I was referring to the metropolis, but I may be wrong in what I state. It is a question upon which I am hardly competent to give a correct answer.

Mr. *Elliot.*

3369. Do you not think that if the Americans acknowledge that the meat that they send over here will pay at 6½*d.* per pound, it is rather likely that something less than 6½*d.* will suit their purpose?—I do not for that class of meat.

3370. You think that class of meat is very good?—It is very good.

3371. Did you hear a witness say the other day that he had delivered meat at the New York market at 1¾*d.* per pound?—He spoke about the weight of a live bullock. Possibly he might get some of their great raw-boned American beasts which very much correspond to the Swedish beasts; and the weight of meat in comparison with the offal would not at all bear any favourable comparison; it would be very dear even then.

3372. Supposing that it was 2½*d.* per pound in New York, could they not send it to this country for less than 6½*d.* per pound?—I do not believe he meant the class of bullock that they have been sending to this country.

3373. Does it not often happen that our own beef has to be sold at a reduced price, especially when there is a glut in the market?—Occasionally when the weather is very hot, and when there is a larger supply than is required, the salesmen are obliged to sell at the best price they can get; but still I do not remember such sacrifices having been made as have been made with the American beef, because our meat would be in far better condition.

Mr. *Jacob Bright.*

3374. I understood you to say that nearly all the butchers in London sell American meat?—A great many of them do.

3375. Do most of the butchers in the West-end sell it?—A great many of them do.

3376. Then we may be every day eating American beef and mutton without knowing it?—You

Mr. *Jacob Bright*—continued.

—You may be eating beef, but there is very little mutton.

3377. Have you eaten this beef yourself?—I have.

3378. Have you eaten it often?—No, not often.

3379. But enough to test its quality?—Yes.

3380. Is there any peculiar insipidity or want of taste in this beef; has it as much flavour as the English beef?—One piece that I tasted was very beautiful when it was hot, but it seemed not so good as our own meat when it was cold; it seemed to lose its gravy; all the gravy seemed to go out of it after it was cut; but still it was very tender and very nice.

3381. It did not have the same flavour as the English meat when it was cold?—All English meat does not eat alike, you know. I say that, as a rule, American beef is very good food for the people.

3382. You have given us the figures of the imports of this meat into London for about five months?—Twenty weeks.

3383. Can you tell us whether much American meat came to London during the past week?—Yes, there was a fairish supply during the last week.

3384. Was there what you would call an average supply?—Yes.

3385. By an average supply, how many tons do you mean; 600 tons?—No, that is not the average, but there was a good fair supply.

3386. Do you suppose that each week London received anything like 300 tons of American beef?—I should think so.

3387. Last week would test this meat very much, owing to the great heat of the weather, would it not?—Yes.

3388. Did this American meat last week obtain tolerably good prices?—No, a great deal of that meat last week was in very bad condition. On one morning there were 12 tons condemned, and on another morning there were six tons condemned; it was entirely spoilt, and not fit for human food at all.

3389. There have been other weeks when it has been condemned, have there not?—Yes, but that has been through some failure of the machinery, or over packing, or something of the sort.

3390. Do you think that the meat last week was exceptionally bad, or that it was in the average condition that it has been in during the past six months?—It varies very much. On some occasions it comes in very good condition indeed, and on some occasions it comes in very indifferent condition.

3391. Do you know whether the prices obtained last week were satisfactory prices?—I should think not.

3392. You do not know whether the meat sold at a very low price?—Good fore-quarters of beef, last week were selling at 10*d.* and 1*s.* per stone.

3393. I merely asked the question with the view of ascertaining whether the heat of last week had any effect upon the meat?—On Friday morning last there were plenty of good fore-quarters of American beef, good enough for food, too good for the inspector to interfere with, that were sold at 10*d.* and 1*s.* per stone.

Mr. *Jacob Bright*—continued.

3394. When you say that it is in bad condition, but not in a condition to be condemned, is it disagreeable to eat?—I believe that the outer surfaces are uneatable. It requires a good deal of washing and a good deal of trimming. The outer surfaces would be in a very musty condition. There is nothing more objectionable to myself than to get a piece of musty meat in my mouth, and I believe it would be so with the majority of people. When all that must is trimmed away, a quarter of beef might lose five or six stone, and then the body of the meat would be good.

Mr. *M'Lagan.*

3395. It has been given in evidence that the American meat which has been imported here has been insipid; from your evidence it would appear that when hot it is not insipid, but that it becomes somewhat insipid when cold?—I was speaking about the piece that I had tasted. Some of the other might have been different.

3396. I think you said that you had found the same kind of differences in British beef?—Yes, all British cattle do not eat alike.

3397. That may arise from the difference in the age of the animal or from a different mode of feeding?—Yes.

3398. And therefore you say that that is no objection whatever to the importation of this meat?—None whatever.

3399. Would the importation of dead meat have much effect upon your trade, supposing that there was no importation whatever of live stock?—I believe it would render our trade almost unworkable. When the weather is warm, some mornings you require a great deal of meat, and some mornings you require very little. The benefit of a butcher having live animals in his possession is that he can kill them as he requires them for his trade, or go to the market as he requires them.

3400. But you will still have the English cattle for that purpose?—The English cattle without the addition of the foreign cattle would go to a very high price. I think that it would be a very great loss to the people of the country to lose the supply of foreign live cattle.

3401. I understand that it is a matter of great importance to you as a butcher that there should be still an importation of live stock?—I think so.

3402. You have no objection whatever to the importation of dead meat from America?—Certainly not.

3403. But you think that that should not be extended to the Continent?—It should not be extended to the Continent.

3404. And the reason that you give for that is that the beef from the Continent is then in quality not so good as the American beef?—It is so.

3405. And that is the only reason you give for it?—That is the only reason.

3406. And that arises not from the distance that the cattle have to be brought, or from any other circumstance except the breed of the cattle?—That is so.

3407. As I understand from your evidence, the Americans have shown a great deal more energy in improving their stock than the Continental breeders have shown?—They have.

Mr. *Lyon.*

11 June 1877.

Mr. *Lyon.*

11 June 1877.

Mr. *M'Lagan*—continued.

3408. You say that you approve of the importation of dead meat?—Yes.

3409. But you do not wish it to be extended to the Continent because you think that it is necessary to have live-stock imported from the Continent?—I believe that it would put the foreigners in such a position that they would not be able to compete, and therefore we should lose their trade altogether.

3410. But they may improve their stock?—It will take them some years to improve their stock.

3411. Supposing that their cattle were quite as good on the Continent, do you think that it would be a good thing for us then to have dead meat imported from the Continent?—Not to shut out the live-stock, I should say. I believe that a live importation is a most important one to the country generally.

3412. As I understand, it will take 10 days to bring the American beef to this country; it would only take three or four days to bring dead meat from the Continent, and, *cæteris paribus*, there being the same quality of meat in both places, do you not think that we should get better fresh meat from the Continent than we should from America?—I do not.

3413. I am supposing the cattle to be the same?—If they were the same, you would get better meat from the Continent, as a natural consequence.

3414. If, then, the importation of dead meat from America is a good thing, in your estimation, it will be a still better thing to have it imported from the Continent, if the stock was the same?—I do not know that it would. I believe that they might overdo it, so that it would be remunerative to neither party, unless they could bring a regular supply. So much depends upon the winds and waves. At times we should get no supply, and beef would be worth anything that was asked for it; and at another time we should get such a glut that it would hardly fetch anything.

3415. But if you had dead meat imported from the Continent, you would have a far more regular supply than you have from America, would you not?—They would have first to get the machinery; and I do not think, from what I have seen and heard from foreigners, that we should get it at all.

3416. I do not think so either, because of the kind of cattle that they have at the present time, and it would alter their system of agriculture; but we have to look to ourselves, as well as the foreigners have to look to themselves?—Yes.

3417. But you think that if we could get as good beef imported from the Continent as we have imported at the present time from America, it would be a good thing for this country?—I do not; because I tell you that it is a most important thing for the butchers of this country to have the live animals by them, to keep them for the trade, as they require them.

3418. That is for the butchers?—That is for the butchers and for the public. I think that if all the meat were imported in that way dead, we should sometimes get great gluts, and at other times scarcely anything; and sometimes, if the meat came bad, London might go without its dinner altogether.

Mr. *M'Lagan*—continued.

3419. I understand that the freights from America are at present very low, lower than the average; do you know that?—I do not.

Mr. *Torr.*

3420. I think you said that you are the Master of the Butchers' Company?—I am, at the present time.

3421. Is it a guild?—Yes, it is one of the City guilds.

3422. Are you practically acquainted with all the details of the butcher's work?—I have been in business for 25 years, on my own account, as a carcase butcher; I have killed, on an average, 80 head of cattle a week, so that I have some little experience.

3423. And you are a wholesale butcher?—Yes.

3424. You have, I suppose, confined your attention principally to butchering?—My attention has been chiefly confined to buying the cattle alive in the Metropolitan Cattle Market, and likewise at Romford, and slaughtering them for the home trade.

3425. Do you buy, say, 20 or 30 head of imported cattle, and then sell them?—I slaughter them; I do not sell them alive.

3426. Do you keep this stock alive to supply the small butchers?—No; I slaughter them, and sell them as meat.

3427. You have given to this Committee a very wide range of information, I should say, on other subjects rather than on butchering; you have given us the relative costs of the live animals and the dead meat from the Continent, and, in answer to the honourable Member for Hull, you said that you thought it would cost very nearly as much to import dead meat from Hamburg as it did from New York?—I beg your pardon; I did not say that. I said that I had no knowledge of that; I spoke only about the price of the live cattle, and not of the dead meat.

3428. You said that you believe that the live cattle could be imported at about 1*l.* per head; did you ever import any yourself?—No; but I am well acquainted with importers.

3429. We value the evidence which is given before this Committee pretty much in proportion to a man's practical knowledge of the subject?—I do not know anything about the rate at which dead meat is carried from these countries.

3430. Nor, perhaps, do you know the cost of importing dead meat from America?—I do not; and I have stated that I do not.

3431. Nor, perhaps, do you know the reason why these failures have occurred in the condition of the meat, or why some American meat has come in perfect order, and why at other times it has been of such inferior quality as to cause it all to be sent to this market; in the twentieth week, when 700 tons came, you say that it arrived in Liverpool in such bad condition that the provincial markets would not buy it, and in consequence it came to the London market?—Yes.

3432. Would not a large quantity like that, thrown on the London market in one week, naturally prejudice many large London buyers against all that beef?—I am not a London buyer. It certainly did prejudice the buyers, because there

Mr. *Torr*—continued.

there was such a quantity of it. With regard to the condition, of course I know, from those who have told me, that the ice sometimes runs out, and the machinery is liable to break down; and they will be always subject to these contingencies. A rod may break down that cannot be repaired on the voyage, and it may cause a cargo of meat to be spoilt; it is very unfortunate, but it is unquestionably the fact, that it does come to hand occasionally in very bad condition, and sometimes comes as good. I remember last August, in the very hottest weather, a cargo of beef coming in the most capital condition; I have never seen a cargo come in better condition than that.

3433. Then that fact is of value to this Committee, that in the very hottest month of the year American dead-meat was imported and brought into this market in splendid condition?—In very fine condition; and I believe that the weather at that time was very hot in New York.

3434. Does not that prove that beef can be imported in the very hottest weather, and that those other cases are rather exceptions, in the same way as all large trades when they first commence are liable to grievous blunders and great mistakes?—I admit that.

3435. Although that has occurred, do you not think that with fair mercantile knowledge those evils will be remedied?—They may be, but they will always be liable to accident.

3436. That is as you fancy; but you are a butcher, and not an importing merchant, and therefore it is a mere idea on your part that they will be liable?—Yes; I cannot look forward, but I can look backward; I can only state what has occurred.

3437. And you have stated the valuable fact that in the month of August, which is the hottest month of the year, beef was imported in splendid condition. Were you here on Friday?—Yes.

3438. Did you hear it given in evidence by a man who is not exactly in your trade, Mr. Link, that he supplied American beef to the West-end clubs, to many of the noblemen of this country, and even to Her Majesty herself?—He sent a piece to Her Majesty, but I daresay he did not pick a mouldy piece to send, you know. If you wish to see it, I could have brought some pieces here that you would really be disgusted at. But the fact is that they are liable to these difficulties; if the difficulties can be got over it will be so much the better.

3439. It shows that these difficulties can be got over, and that you can have a very superior article of dead meat imported through New York and brought to the West-end market of London, and that it will sell fairly *pari passu* with English meat?—It has been so, and there is no reason why it should not continue.

3440. You laid a great deal of stress on the value of live cattle from the Continent, and you argued chiefly that it is very desirable that the butcher should not have all his stock in the shop of dead meat, but that he should have a reserve of live animals?—Yes.

3441. But against that did you not tell us that you had seen a piece of American beef hung up in a butcher's shop for 11 weeks, and that at the end of 11 weeks it was in fine condition?—No, I did not say that it was in fine condition, I said it was sweet.

Mr. *Torr*—continued.

3442. If you have seen this American beef imported, and in such fine condition that it can be kept for 11 weeks, is it peremptorily necessary that all the butchers should sell their American imports immediately they get them; could they not have a reserve of that imported meat in such a condition that it will carry them over days, and even weeks?—It would all depend upon the condition of the weather. This was an aitch-bone of beef hung up in a very airy place to see how long it would keep, and although it looked very bad at the end of the time, still it was sweet.

3443. When the Americans have perfected their style of importing dead meat, do you not think that the Continental people will be able to avail themselves of the same mode of importing meat much better than they now think themselves capable of doing?—That is a question which it is for themselves to answer; I do not think they could do it.

3444. But you could not give a direct negative to that?—I could not give a direct negative to it; that is a mere question for the people themselves to answer.

3445. You have said what a great damage the recurrence of the cattle plague is to the food supply of the nation; it is not a mere momentary supply of meat to the market, it is a permanent and regular supply, which you yourself want to get?—Yes.

3446. In the early part of your evidence I think some allusion was made to the loss of your trade by the recurrence of the cattle plague?—There is no doubt that in the last visitation of cattle plague it was a very serious loss to the country, because the cattle plague got all over the country. It was rife for several weeks before it was known what the disease was, and during that time it had spread throughout the whole of the country; but, however, with the few mistakes which were made, and which were soon rectified, this time the cattle plague has been stamped out, and the loss will, happily, not be very serious.

3447. Of course you are aware that the primary object of this country importing meat, and our trying to induce the Continental people to send their meat dead instead of alive, is not out of any spite against them as cattle-feeders, or as farmers, but is simply to protect our own herds, and thereby to protect the meat supply for the nation; it is not an individual feeling on the part of English farmers as against Holstein farmers or German farmers, is it?—I cannot help thinking that there may be some feeling on the part of English gentlemen, that if the foreign supply were shut out they would greatly benefit by that; but still, at the same time, we can only take things as we find them, and I say, from my long experience, that the Continental supply is a most important addition to the meat supply of this country.

3448. You said that the want of ice would be a drawback to the importation of deat meat from the Continent; do you know at all how much ice it requires for the import of a carcase from New York?—They would not go by the carcase; they have a chamber, and they have a large supply of ice placed in a certain position, I believe, in this chamber; but I believe that ice can be obtained

Mr. *Lyon.*

11 June 1877.

Mr. *Torr*—continued.

in New York much more cheaply and easily than in Schleswig-Holstein.

3449. You have no knowledge of that fact, have you?—I have heard it discussed amongst gentlemen who have a knowledge of it; and a gentleman will be before you, Mr. Gibbert, who will be able to speak as to that.

3450. Of course New York is a place where ice is largely consumed, and therefore it has become cheaper; and there is no reason why it should not be as cheap in Holstein; you heard the evidence which was given on Friday by Mr. Link and also by Mr. Gillett, that they themselves feel that they have not attained to the most perfect mode of sending beef from America to England?—That is very certain. Take for instance the steamship the "City of Brussels" that broke down recently; there were 1,250 quarters of beef on that vessel, all of which had to be thrown into the sea at a certain point; when they ran out of ice the meat began to smell, and it was valueless. Another cargo pretty nearly twelve months ago came to hand, and was sent on to the London market, but it was nearly all condemned; it was in a very bad condition. It was not a total loss, but it was very nearly so.

3451. Do you know how many days the "City of Brussels" was at sea?—I do not know how many days it was from the time she left New York to the time that the meat was thrown overboard; but I am only mentioning that to show the contingencies which arise, entailing very heavy loss.

3452. Supposing that those animals had been alive, do you think that they would have been able to keep them alive?—If they had had plenty of food, they might have kept them alive.

3453. You are an advocate for importing live animals; those 1,250 quarters would have been equivalent to about 300 bullocks; that ship started with the idea that she would be 10 days on her voyage, instead of which she was about 25 days; if she had had 300 bullocks on board, and had hay and straw sufficient for only 10 days, what would have been the condition of those bullocks; they would have gone overboard long before that, would they not?—I do not advocate the importation of live animals from America as against dead meat.

Mr. *Assheton.*

3454. I suppose they are all fish that come to your net; you do not mind where your beef comes from so long as it comes in good and saleable condition?—Not at all.

3455. Can you give me any information as to the trade in dead meat from Scotland?—I remember the time when the Scotch people could send such a quantity of meat upon the London market that they could put the trade in almost as bad a condition as it has occasionally been with the great import of American meat. I remember that some years ago, the quantity of Scotch meat in the London market was so great that it could hardly be vended.

3456. I am talking entirely of dead meat from Scotland?—I am speaking of dead meat. That will be possibly 20 years ago.

3457. What is the present state of the market?—The importation from Scotland has so fallen off during the last few years, that it is nothing to compare with what it used to be, and the price has gone up in proportion.

Mr. *Assheton*—continued.

3458. What is about the present amount of dead meat per week that comes into London from Scotland?—I cannot say, but it is nothing to what it used to be.

3459. I have not the remotest idea whether it is one bullock or a thousand; is it a train a day or a train a week?—There are several days in the week when Scotch meat comes; you ought to ask the question of a Scotch salesman, but I know it is nothing in comparison to what it used to be.

3460. What sort of condition does it arrive in?—Generally very good.

3461. Does it arrive in as good a condition as the meat that is generally slaughtered in London?—Mostly, unless the weather is very hot, and then it would not be. There is no attempt made to prepare meat in Scotland in the manner that it is prepared in America by a cooling-house, or anything of that sort.

3462. I saw, on Saturday, a train of vans on the Great Western Railway, near Paddington, all marked "meat van;" apparently they were vans made for the purpose of carrying meat; what trade would they be carrying on?—I do not know, I am sure.

3463. You do not know of any dead meat trade that comes into London on the Great Western Railway?—Yes, some of the American meat comes to Bristol, and is brought up that way. Possibly they might have been vans for bringing American meat from Bristol.

3464. You told the Committee that some of the American meat which came to London fetched high prices?—Yes.

3465. Do you suppose that the bulk of that was sold honestly as American meat, or was it sold, I may say, surreptitiously as British meat?—A butcher going into the London central market knows a piece of American meat as well as he knows a piece of Scotch meat.

3466. But, in your opinion, was that meat sold to the eater as American meat, or was it sold as British meat?—I could not say. Some people prefer the American meat, and the butchers would only provide them with American meat if they asked for it. But I should say that, as to a great deal of it, there is no question asked as to whether it is British meat, or American meat, or Scotch meat; a supply is sent in, and it is used, and it gives satisfaction.

3467. Then I gather that you think most of it was sold as British meat?—I should think very probably. There would be no deception, because there would be no questions asked.

3468. When you imported dead meat from Belgium a few years ago, I think I understood that you did not take any means to refrigerate?—No; a great deal came from Belgium and Holland.

3469. You told an honourable Member something about the weight of the offal of an ordinary bullock; can you tell me what is the value of the offal of an ordinary bullock in London?—It varies very much; it would depend on what part you take of it. We consider the hide, the feet, and everything else as portions of the offal.

3470. Will you be good enough, first of all, to specify what you mean by offal, and then to tell me what you think it is worth?—The offal which has been referred to here would mean, I believe, the offal which is consumable as food by the poor

Mr. *Assheton*—continued.

poor in London; that would be the tripe, the liver, the heart, the kidneys, the sweetbread, the skirts, the tail, and the head.

3471. What is the worth of that?—It varies very much according to the size and quality of the animal.

3472. Say that the carcase is worth 20*l.*; what will the offal be worth?—The offal will sell possibly for about 15*s.* or 16*s.*

3473. To go back to the continental beasts, I understood you to say that you had to kill the continental beasts and sell the beef pretty quickly, otherwise it lost its bloom?—It does.

3474. If you killed good British beasts the meat would not lose its bloom, would it, in the same time?—Even if it lost its bloom to some extent it would not be much depreciated in value unless it was kept an unduly long time.

3475. Then may I put it in this way: that the continental beef is of such an inferior description that it must be disposed of quickly or you cannot pass it on to your customers?—You cannot say that it is of an inferior description, because it is a very useful meat; but still it is a thinner class of meat, and it depreciates much more than a thicker and better article.

3476. You told us about some American beef being condemned last week for being in bad condition; I suppose you have heard of some British beef being condemned?—Oh yes.

3477. Was any condemned last week?—I do not know that any was condemned on account of loss by the weather.

Mr. *Wilbraham Egerton.*

3478. With regard to the Deptford Market, was the price of animals there higher than in the Metropolitan Market before the outbreak of cattle plague?—I have never bought any at Deptford, and therefore I cannot say.

3479. Then you are not able to speak about Deptford Market?—No.

3480. Are you able to say whether the offal of animals slaughtered at Deptford is sent into the north?—I cannot say anything with respect to the internal working of the Deptford Market.

Mr. *W. E. Forster.*

3481. Taking the week in which there was the greatest import of dead meat into London, are you able to form any idea what proportion that import would bear to the whole of the meat consumed in London?—I am not.

3482. Have you ever tried to make a reasonable guess as to that?—No, I have not; it is not a thing that I have thought about.

3483. I suppose you would consider that it would have to increase very largely before it would make up for the loss of the present live meat trade?—It would have to increase, decidedly.

3484. You do not deal at Deptford yourself?—No.

3485. Can you tell the Committee distinctly how it comes to be a loss for cattle to be sent to Deptford?—I have never followed Deptford as a market. Finding the other market sufficient, and the things coming, as it were, irregularly to Deptford and being sold at almost any time, I have not followed it to go into the matter; but I believe that there are additional expenses at

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

Deptford Market, though personally I could not give any information upon the subject.

3486. Is there a railway up to Deptford Market now?—I believe not.

3487. How near to the market does the railway get?—I cannot say; I should think it is something like a quarter of a mile. I have only been to it about once, and then I walked from Deptford Station.

3488. You buy your cattle at Islington; where is your shop, or your office, or your place of business?—In Aldgate High-street, commonly known as Whitechapel Market.

3489. How far are you from Islington Market?—About four miles.

3490. And how far are you from Deptford?—I suppose somewhere about the same distance.

3491. I am not giving any opinion upon the matter, but supposing that all the continental cattle came to Deptford, and that instead of coming irregularly, they came regularly, do you think that then men in your position would attend the Deptford Market?—Yes, but it would shut out a great many of the other buyers; a great many of the small buyers.

3492. Will you explain why?—You will admit that a very valuable portion of a retail butcher's premises is his private slaughter-house. A man can go into the market, and he can buy one, or two, or three, or four beasts, and a certain number of sheep, and he can get them taken home by paying simply for the droving. He has lairage on his own premises, and he can give them hay and water, and kill them just as he requires them for his trade. The same men who work his business at home, who cut up and sell his meat and do his shop-work, kill the beasts, and therefore there is no additional expense on that. If he goes into the Deptford Market, the cattle must be slaughtered within the walls of the market. It would not pay him to take a slaughter-house; he would have to kill in some one else's slaughter-house; he would have to pay additional expense on the beasts being killed in a slaughter-house, or he would have to send for his own men and kill them in the corporation slaughter-house, the men losing, perhaps, the best part of the day in that. Then there is the wear and tear of horses and carts. Then, further, there is a great deal of robbery going on in those places. I have heard of people killing bullocks, and losing a great portion of the offal. Therefore it would shut out a great number of the buyers.

3493. There are a good many private slaughter-houses, are there not, in what you may call the Deptford area?—Yes; they are slaughter-houses let to butchers, but mostly to wholesale men.

3494. What you mean is this: that a large number of butchers who would not carry on sufficient business to take one of those slaughter-houses would be in a difficulty?—Yes.

3495. You yourself, of course, if you attended the Deptford Market, would take one of those shops?—If I found that I could not get sufficient cattle for my trade from Islington and Romford, I might be driven there; but I find it sufficient work at present, without going there.

3496. There was an Act passed, was there not, to put an end to private slaughter-houses?

Mr. *Lyon.*

11 June 1877.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

—There was an Act passed to put an end to private slaughter-houses, which came into force, I believe, in 1874 or 1875; but the butchers of London made out such a good case before a Committee of the House of Commons that that Act was repealed, and the slaughter-houses were allowed to continue.

3497. So that they consider themselves pretty safe as regards the private slaughter-houses?—They are under strict rules and regulations. A great many of the worst slaughter-houses have been abolished, and the present slaughter-houses are all under the Metropolitan Board of Works or the Corporation of London.

3498. Take a foreign beast coming, we will say, from Hamburg; what is your opinion as to what that beast would fetch if it was allowed to go into the Islington Market as compared with what it would fetch if it went into the Deptford Market?—That is a question as to which I could not give an opinion, because you will get beasts from 7 *l.* and 8 *l.* a-piece to 30 *l.* a-piece. There is such a great variety in the cost and value of the animal, that I could not give an opinion upon that subject.

3499. You buy foreign beasts yourself, I suppose?—All sorts.

3500. What is the most valuable foreign beast, as a general rule, that goes into the Islington Market?—The Danish and Schleswig-Holstein cattle.

3501. Do you attend the market pretty regularly?—Yes.

3502. Do you find more or less foot-and-mouth disease amongst the foreign animals as compared with the home animals?—I believe less.

3503. Supposing that the importation of live cattle from the Continent was stopped, what effect do you think it would have upon the price of meat?—It would make it very much dearer.

3504. Can you give us any sort of notion as to how much dearer you think it would make it?—No; it would all depend upon the supply; but I believe that anything that prevents meat coming must necessarily make it dearer.

Chairman.

3505. I think you stated, in answer to a question that was put to you, that on the 1st of June American meat was selling at 1*s.* 8*d.* per stone, and was being hawked in costermongers' barrows at about 4*d.* per lb.?—A great deal of it was sold at a great deal less than 1*s.* 8*d.* per stone; at 8*d.*, 10*d.*, and 1*s.*

3506. A large proportion of the meat which was so sold was in very good condition, was it not?—Externally it was not in good condition, but it was sweet.

3507. I understood you to say that when it was properly trimmed it would be good food?—It would be good food when trimmed.

3508. And it did find a sale, I suppose?—Yes.

3509. In that way it was a great benefit to the poorer classes of the district, was it not?—It would be so.

3510. And therefore this trade, if it continued, would, by diminishing the price, tend to be serviceable to the consumer?—There is no doubt that it is very serviceable.

Chairman—continued.

3511. I understood you to say that in your opinion the importation of live cattle was absolutely necessary for the country, in consequence of it being requisite to regulate the trade?—Yes.

3512. Supposing that you could go into the market and be certain of purchasing the dead meat in as good a condition as you have described, would you not be able to regulate your trade in the same way as by purchasing and keeping the beasts?—It is not my trade; I am in a different trade; I am a seller, I am not a buyer; but I believe that the butchers could not at all times depend upon a supply of this dead meat.

3513. What I understood you to say was that for the butcher who slaughtered it was absolutely necessary that he should have the animals on his place, so as to slaughter them as his customer required it?—Yes.

3514. Supposing that he could go into the market and be certain of buying dead meat in the condition in which you describe that it arrives in London, or that some parts of it arrive in London, would he not be able to regulate his trade with the dead meat just as well as he would by having the animals on his own place?—You are getting into the area of supposition. If it were possible for him at all times to be sure of the supply, then it would be so.

3515. You admit that the August cargo that you remember arriving, arrived at a time when the temperature was at its highest?—Yes, and it could not have arrived in better condition.

3516. And you understand that that arrived at a time when the temperature at New York was also very high?—Yes.

3517. Does not that tend to show that if proper care is taken it is quite possible to place upon the market here meat in good condition from America?—Yes; I was told at the time that it was a very light cargo, and that very great care had been taken with that cargo.

3518. At present, I imagine that the trade, being in its infancy, experiments are being perpetually made to see how near they can sail to the wind, so to say, as to profit?—It may be so.

3519. But when once the trade is established, it is quite possible, is it not, that they may deliver in this market a supply of meat in good condition at a fair remunerative price to the sender?—The question again arises whether, if England were too much dependent upon the American supply, the price, like that of the Scotch meat, would not very considerably advance.

3520. Are you aware what amount of foreign import you have been relying upon lately for supplying these butchers who, as you say, depend very much upon purchasing and slaughtering in their own places?—There has been a fair supply of foreigners lately; Denmark has sent a great many during the spring of this year, and even up to the present time.

3521. Are you aware that, in consequence of the restrictions during the last 13 weeks, a larger proportion of the cattle from abroad have had to be slaughtered at Deptford?—Yes.

3522. And that, consequently, to that extent, the market has been dependent either upon the dead meat trade or upon the English market for the supply of cattle to be taken home for slaughter?—I believe that there have been many sheep at Deptford during the last few weeks, but that

Chairman—continued.

that the supply of horned cattle has been very small.

3523. The last return shows 969 slaughtered at Deptford, out of 1,464 imported from abroad; that shows, does it not, that at present you are almost dependent upon the Cattle Market for this supply which you say is necessary to the butcher's trade?—Yes.

3524. And that the foreign cattle supply, in consequence of by far the greater portion being slaughtered at Deptford, cannot meet this necessary requirement of the trade?—No, I believe that many of the Danish cattle are now sent to Newcastle, because there they can go free.

3525. The Danish cattle can go free in London, can they not?—Only within the metropolitan area.

3526. But they go to the Islington Market; they are not necessarily sent to Deptford for slaughter?—No.

3527. I suppose that the foreign import is at its height when the Schleswig-Holstein cattle come in?—It is.

3528. An that is between June and October?—From the back end of June to November.

3529. But during the other months when they do not come here, and for some months the trade has been very materially dependent either upon the dead-meat trade or upon the Islington Market, has it not?—Yes.

3530. Is there any difference in the time when the fat cattle come into the Islington Market?—At the back end of the year we always get a much larger supply than at any other time; that is to say, at the same time as the Schleswig-Holstein cattle are coming; we have a large supply from the grazing districts of Leicestershire. We generally have a much larger supply during the autumn months of the year.

3531. Then, in fact, in the autumn months of the year you seem to have the general supply both from the Continent and from our own grazing districts?—Yes, from Leicestershire, and from Northamptonshire, and those parts.

3532. How do you regulate the trade in those other parts of the year when you are not in possession of either the home supply or the foreign imported supply?—At the other part of the year we have the beasts from Norfolk and those counties.

3533. But during the hot weather, when it is most necessary that you should have cattle, as you say, to stand in the lairs for slaughtering according to the wants of your consumers, you have the least supply in the market?—We get a fair supply. They have just begun to-day; I have seen some cattle out of the Essex marshes on the market to day. There are very large tracts of land in Essex where the cattle are grazed. As one supply falls off, another seems to come on.

3534. But those come into the Islington Market, and do not affect the question as to the import of foreign cattle?—No.

3535. And whilst you have been now for some time in a great measure without that foreign supply, in consequence of the restrictions, you have been dependent for the regulation of your trade upon the supply of dead meat which has been thrown into the market?—Yes, and the other countries which have been supplying, have sent, I believe, more largely. I think it will

Chairman—continued.

be found that Spain has sent a much greater number.

3536. The total import of cattle during the quarter ending March, was 7,054, and of those, 457 went to Deptford; so that there is no great increase of foreign import?—There is no doubt that the American meat made up the supply.

3537. You believe that the American meat has come in very opportunely, at a time when the foreign supply has been practically stopped or restricted to slaughter at Deptford?—Yes; with the restrictions that we have had since last January, if it had not been for the supply of American meat, the price of meat must have been very materially increased.

3538. And that price has been kept down, and in some instances the consumer has benefited to the extent that you have described to the Committee?—No doubt.

3539. Supposing that to have been the case up to the time that you have just mentioned, does it not appear to you that it might be possible, if you could make the American dead-meat trade a continuous trade, to go on still without a very large amount of import from abroad?—I do not think that it would be just to foreigners. I think that we are almost as much indebted to foreigners for years past in grazing and feeding, and sending cattle to this country as we are now to the Americans.

3540. That is another point altogether. You say that, by the introduction of American meat, you have, for a certain period, been able to supply the consumers in London, although the import from abroad has been to a great extent closed, and a large proportion of that which comes has been slaughtered at the port?—Yes.

3541. When I ask you whether that being the case, if the American meat becomes a continuous supply, you will not be able to do so, you do not answer that it is impossible, but you say that it would be hard upon the foreign trader?—I think that if you shut out the continental supply, you would find that the American supply would very much go up in price. I do not think that an American is a bad tradesman, and I do not think that he would send to this country for a small profit, if it is possible to get a large one.

3542. At the same time, you are aware that the prices have not gone up during the year and a quarter that the American dead meat trade has been a continuous trade?—No; circumstances have not given them an advantage, but I believe that, if circumstances gave the Americans and their salesmen an advantage, they would be quite as ready to take the advantage as Englishmen.

5343. There was a question put to you, in answer to which you said that you yourself thought that the American meat was very good when hot, and you agreed with the witness who has already stated to the Committee that when it was cold it was not so good?—I did not find any fault with it when it was cold, but it seemed to me almost flavourless.

3544. You have also stated to the Committee now that you believe that a very large number of customers in London are being supplied with American meat because no questions are asked, as I think you said, and that American meat is sent by butchers to a very large number of people as English meat?—That is my opinion.

3545. Have

Mr. *Lyon.*

11 June 1877

Chairman—continued.

3545. Have any complaints come to your knowledge from customers as to the condition, or flavour, or quality of this meat?—No; but I believe that a great many gentlemen having large households in London have a joint of beef on the table, and they do not ask for it to come on cold, and in all probability they do not taste it cold, but it goes away to the servants.

3546. Do you not believe that the servants, the terror of all households, would probably find out if it was not as good as English beef?—I believe that it is as good.

3547. Then you admit not only that the American meat is as good as the English meat, but that it has met the want which has been created by the stoppage of the import of foreign meat?—I believe that we are very much indebted as a community to the Americans for having sent it.

3548. You are aware of the condition in which the American meat comes to the port to which it is sent; that it comes in a chamber in a certain temperature which preserves it in a condition for the market?—I should think that a great deal of it becomes spoilt in that chamber; it would be impossible for the meat being brought in a ship to Liverpool, and then being brought only from Liverpool into our market, to get into that condition between the time when it is brought out of the ship, and the time that it is brought into the market. I believe that a great deal of it came into that condition from adverse circumstances in the chamber, through its being packed too closely, and the air not being allowed to work freely around it.

3549. The cargo, that I understood you to say arrived in August in such perfect condition, came in one of those chambers, did it not?—It did.

3550. And you attribute its being in such good condition to the fact of its having been properly treated before it started?—One of the gentlemen connected with it at the time, told me that it was a very light cargo, and that they had taken very great care of it

3551. And great care having been taken, it was brought over in good condition?—It was in beautiful condition.

3552. Do you not think that by establishing arrangements, say, at Smithfield, or at other places which are centres of trade, so that the meat might be brought from abroad in that chamber, and be carried to one of those centres in the chamber in which it had travelled, and from which it could be taken out as the supply required it, you would be able, in a great measure, to get over the difficulty which you have described, of a small butcher fearing that he would not be able to supply his customers in hot weather?—I do not suppose that it would be possible to bring the chambers out of the ship with the meat in them; that is a question for the American importers themselves.

3553. If it were possible that they could so arrange the process as to deliver the meat on the London market in the temperature in which it had been carried over, it would be able to remain there, would it not, without being exposed to changes of atmosphere until it was wanted for consumption?—If it was in good condition when the box was opened, of course it would.

Mr. *Ritchie.*

3554. Did I correctly understand you to say, in answer to a question which was put to you by the right honourable gentleman, the Member for Bradford, that you found more foot-and-mouth disease amongst English cattle than amongst foreign cattle?—I did.

3555. Is that the present state of things?—I do not believe that there is any foot-and-mouth disease about now; I have not seen any for some time.

3556. Of what period were you speaking?—I was speaking of the early part of the year, soon after Christmas; I believe that a good deal of foot-and-mouth disease is brought into this country by the Irish cattle. It seems to me that the Irish cattle travel a good deal between fairs and markets before they are shipped and come to Bristol; and I believe that we have more foot-and-mouth disease amongst imported Irish cattle than amongst any cattle.

3557. As a matter of fact, foreign cattle affected with foot-and-mouth disease are not allowed to come into the London market, are they?—They are not.

3558. Do you believe that the slaughtering of the cattle at Deptford would have any effect upon the price to the consumer?—I do not know that it would. I could not say that it would not materially raise the price, certainly.

3559. Would it not, perhaps, rather have the effect of lowering the price to the consumer because of the additional safety that it would give to home-grown cattle?—I do not know that it would give additional safety.

3560. Not if the cattle were slaughtered at the point of debarcation?—I do not think so, because my opinion is that the health of foreign cattle contrasts most favourably with our own.

3561. But we know that it is a matter of fact that cattle disease comes here?—I do not know that. That is a theory which is now set forward, but do you think if there were no importation of foreign cattle, all disease would be shut out? I think not; I think our cattle would always be subject to some disease.

3562. Supposing that we take it for granted that disease is imported by means of foreign cattle, the less you move them about in this country the better it is for our own cattle, I suppose?—Yes, if they are diseased.

3563. Therefore, if it be a fact that disease is imported by means of foreign cattle, it would be to the advantage of our own cattle that foreign cattle should be slaughtered at the point of debarcation, would it not?—If there were any great fear of the disease being carried amongst them, it would.

3564. You said, did you not, that it might, perhaps, inflict some injury upon the smaller men to have cattle slaughtered at Deptford?—It would shut them out from the trade; they would not go there; they could not carry on business under such circumstances.

3565. What proportion do they have to the whole body?—I should think that they have a very large proportion.

3566. You made one statement which I should like you to explain; you said that the importation from Scotland had fallen off tremendously; is that so?—It is so.

3567. Can you give any reason for that?—It has been going for years. I should think that the

Mr. *Ritchie*—continued.

the consumption in Scotland is much greater than it used to be years ago; I believe that is one great reason.

3568. Are you aware what was the price to the consumer before the outbreak of cattle plague in 1865?—I am not.

3569. You do not know what comparison the price at that time bears to the present price?—I do not.

3570. You were going to give me the reason for the importation from Scotland having fallen off?—I believe the consumption in Scotland is much greater than it was 20 or 25 years ago. I believe that is one great reason.

3571. You do not think that the various diseases that have been prevalent have at all affected the breeding of cattle in Scotland?—I think not.

3572. But you do not know, I suppose?—I do not know; I have never heard anything of the sort, and I come in contact with men who would know.

Mr. *Lyon.*

11 June 1877.

Mr. George Rea, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

3573. I believe you are a farmer holding a very large acreage?—Yes.

3574. Can you tell the Committee what the extent of your operations is?—I farm something like 4,000 acres of valuable ploughable or tillage land, and 1,000 acres of pasture or feeding land.

3575. Is the grazing land mixed with the arable?—No, it is old feeding land. The grazing land mixed with the cultivated land I consider as cultivated land; it comes in its rotation.

3576. Your farms are in the north, are they not?—In Northumberland, and in Scotland, and in Lancashire.

3577. Then you have large sheep pastures, too, I believe?—Yes.

3578. To what extent?—I suppose that the extent of the hill pasture that I occupy is something like from 70,000 to 80,000 acres. I have a sheep farm in Scotland of 10 or 12 miles square; I do not know the exact measurement of it.

3579. Will you give the Committee the number of head of stock that you have?—I have something like 12,000 breeding ewes, and of course the younger ages corresponding to produce that number. I have about 4,000 young ewes, ewe-hogs, or gimmers coming on to be ewes, and their lambs at the present moment; and a proportion of older sheep. Altogether I have, say, from 28,000 to 30,000 sheep.

3580. What is your system of farming with regard to sheep?—I do not buy any sheep; I breed them all. I part with the sheep at different ages according to circumstances, such as the prospect of keep and the prospect of markets. I feed a portion of the fat lambs, and I sell a portion of the store lambs. I sell a portion at all ages up to the age at which the ewes naturally go off, what we call draft ewes, at the age of four or five. I may state that I feed for the butcher part of the sheep, but not to the extent that I breed. I breed more essentially to sell for others to fatten.

3581. With regard to your cattle, will you be kind enough to give the number of your stock?—I buy no cattle except the cattle which I wish to finish to send into the fat market. I feed yearly from 150 to 200 cattle, and they are then supposed to go off from two and a-half to three years of age. I have the corresponding younger ages to keep that up, and as far as possible I breed, and wish to breed, and will breed if I find security, as many calves as it is possible for me to breed to keep up that number.

3582. Supposing that you felt the security that you would wish to feel, as I understand, you would increase your breeding of animals upon your farms?—Yes.

Chairman—continued.

3583. At present you limit your cattle for the market very much to the number that you have stated, which you buy in as lean cattle for feeding purposes?—I am obliged to buy in a portion; I have not convenience for breeding all. I should breed more and increase my appliances if I were quite secure. Two years ago, when we considered ourselves tolerably secure from cattle plague, and when the disease was not very bad, I instituted two breeding establishments for the main purpose of rearing calves, and those I am now continuing. They afford me from 60 to 70 calves a year at the present moment. I shall be obliged to augment the cattle by buying. But I ought to state, perhaps, that in Lancashire we have a very good breed of short-horned cattle; I have a portion of grass land, and I am able to keep cattle there for a limited time to suit my own convenience. I have a man stationed there whose principal occupation is to go about amongst the farmers and to buy up young cattle. These are retained on grass land that I occupy there, and are kept together until such times as I want to take them to the North. In the North, turnips are the great things that we feed cattle upon, and I have them come down at a period of the year, perhaps 60 or 80, and sometimes 100 together. After being gathered together and partially grazed in Lancashire, I have them conveyed down to Northumberland to be left over one year and grazed off the next, as the case may be.

3584. Will you describe what has been the effect of the disease on your production of meat, and your general system of farming?—In my opinion, the disease of 1865 and 1866 had a very great tendency to raise the price of meat.

3585. Do you mean the cattle plague of those years?—The cattle plague, I think, had a very great tendency to raise the price of meat. That year, as it happened, I was rather full of sheep in Lancashire. The cattle plague was so very bad in Cheshire that it decimated the country in a great measure, and the Cheshire farmers came and brought sheep in, I might say, rather improperly; they gave more than their worth; at least we thought at that time that they were buying them very dearly. The consequence was, that they put them on grass that was not fitted for them, and I believe that they lost a good many sheep. That was the first cause of it, and since that it has never ruled in the same way that it did before. I think that the outbreak of

Mr. *Rea.*

Mr. *Rea.*

11 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

cattle plague in 1865 has been the means of raising the price of butchers' meat, and that seems to have continued since.

3586. Did it make any difference to your own system of farming that you were carrying on?—Seeing that I tried to keep myself as clear as possible from disease by not going into the market when there was disease in the country, I have not made any material alteration, though I feel that, if we have not protection and security against disease in cattle, it will be perhaps necessary to make an alteration.

3587. I understood you to say just now, that with regard to your Lancashire grass land, you have a person there who goes about purchasing and putting on that grass land young animals before they come down to you on your more northern farms; did it make any difference to you with regard to that part of your farm at the time that the disease was about?—I did not buy, of course, while the disease was about; I stocked my land with sheep. Before passing over the cattle plague, perhaps I might state to you that in May 1865 and 1866, which is the usual time of entry, I took a farm of good land for the purpose of finishing off those cattle. This disease broke out then, and for the next year I had not an animal on the place; I stocked the folds with sheep to break down the straw. As time wore on one got more confidence, and I have a portion on now.

3588. You represent that the fear of disease now, though you do not have it practically, very much diminishes the stock that you keep, and therefore the supply of the country?—I think it has that tendency.

3589. Dealing with the other diseases, pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease, have you had much experience with them?—I have had hardly any experience, I may say, of pleuro-pneumonia; I have generally kept free from it by being careful and keeping out of the market when it was supposed to be prevalent.

3590. Has that in any way interfered with your purchasing in the district around you?—Yes, no doubt it has. I have frequently been short of cattle on account of not thinking it prudent to buy them.

3591. In fact, the existence of these diseases in the country as they exist now, to a great extent limits the stocking of land?—I think that people would stock the land with more cattle if they had greater confidence in doing it.

3592. Have you had any losses from foot-and-mouth disease?—Yes, in both sheep and cattle. The most serious loss I had was about four or five years ago; I had from 40 to 50 cattle forward in condition in the months of September and October that I wanted to put into the market about Christmas; by some ill luck foot-and-mouth disease came amongst them (in fact, I knew whence it came), and those cattle were thrown back, and I was not able to sell them until the months of February and March, thereby having to feed them twice. I considered that the cattle were reduced in value by keeping them, from 2 *l.* to 3 *l.* a head, and it seemed to me that while they were being fed a second time it extracted from the food of the people a considerable quantity of beef.

3593. That is to say, the delays arising in the market from the existence of foot-and-mouth disease diminished the consumption, because you had to keep the cattle over a second preparing?—Quite so; while they were being kept longer than they would have been other cattle were being neglected.

3594. If they had gone off before the disease appeared you would have been able to bring another set of cattle upon the market for consumption?—Quite so.

3595. Have you thought over the possibility of attempting to stamp out pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease by restrictions in our country?—It is very well known that when restrictions were imposed in 1866 and 1867, the country was never more free from pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease.

3596. You confirm the opinion that was expressed by Professor Brown, that during the period when the cattle plague restrictions existed we very nearly stamped out pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease?—I think for a time we did so entirely.

3597. On that ground you would say that although the disease is generally supposed to have become almost indigenous, you believe that with a system of restrictions such as was then adopted, you would be able again to stamp it out?—At all events, it is bringing the risk to a minimum, and I think that we should be able to stamp it out. I think I am expressing the feeling of many of my neighbouring agriculturalists when I say that we should be only too glad to submit to any great restrictions in order to stamp it out.

3598. Are you aware of the evidence that has been given by Professor Brown, and the scheme by which he proposes to stamp it out?—I am in some degree.

3599. Speaking from your own great personal knowledge, and from your knowledge of the opinions of other people who are interested in farming in the country, do you think that they would be prepared, contrary to what Professor Brown stated, to submit to restrictions as to the movement of cattle throughout the country for the purpose of stamping out this disease?—Quite so. Where it was necessary, they would be only too delighted that it should be put in force.

3600. With the object before them of getting rid of a disease which practically very materially limits the stocking of their land?—It would give them very much confidence, and I think that an agriculturalist has, in some degree, a right to expect that he will be protected from disease. It is an anxiety and a care hanging over his head while any disease is going on, that I myself fancy he has no business to be subject to if there is any possibility of stamping it out; and certainly the means that have been proposed are the readiest and the most likely means of checking it and stamping it out.

3601. And where they have been attempted in other countries, such as Denmark and Schleswig-Holstein, they seem to have been effective in stamping it out?—Yes, I believe so. I am not prepared to say that it will be stamped out at once, but I think that I am justified in saying that it would be reduced to a minimum by proper restrictions.

3602. You represent that if it were possible to stamp it out, you would by doing so very much increase the supply of meat for consumption,

Chairman—continued.

tion, because you would induce farmers to increase their stock?—Yes, clearly.

3603. And you would also increase the supply by the fact that you would get the stock upon the market at the proper time, instead of having it delayed, as it very often is, upon the farms in consequence of foot-and-mouth disease coming in and throwing it back?—In speaking of foot-and-mouth disease, I do not think there is anything more annoying and destructive than it is, particularly as to breeding animals. If it gets into a large flock of ewes in the autumn or in the spring before lambing time, no one can tell the havoc that it makes amongst them, and I believe there is inherent in that stock for generations to come a weakness of constitution which otherwise would not exist.

3604. You mean that the stock itself and its subsequent produce suffer very materially from it?—Very materially.

3605. That applies equally, does it not, to breeding cattle?—Unquestionably. I believe it is equally so with cows.

3606. They often drop their calves afterwards, do they not?—I believe it is very well understood that they not only drop their calves, but that they suffer to a great extent themselves for a considerable time in their milking properties.

3607. Have you thought at all of the desirability of stopping the import from abroad, in consequence of your wish to stamp out these diseases?—I do not think we shall ever be secure until it is done, nor shall I feel any chance of security until it is done.

3608. That would come in conjunction, I suppose, with the severe regulations which you propose to carry out in the country itself?—Quite so.

3609. And if the farmers are willing to submit to those regulations, they have a right, in your opinion, to ask that they shall be protected from the importation of the disease again from foreign parts?—I think that farmers would have a great right to complain if restrictions were put on, and the fountain-head, which they consider to be the Continent, were not gone to.

3610. Do you believe that the Continent is the fountain head of pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease, as well as of cattle plague?—I am not prepared to say that.

3611. It is with regard to the fear that is engendered in the mind of the farmer from the importation of cattle plague that you think that importation of live animals from the Continent ought to be restricted or stopped?—I think so.

3612. And you believe that the farmers are willing, with regard to the other complaints, to submit to any regulations which have for their object the eradication of the disease?—There is no doubt of it.

Mr. *W. E. Forster.*

3613. You were a cattle breeder, I suppose, before 1865?—Yes, more or less.

3614. Had you as much land in the trade then as you have now?—Not quite so much, but nearly as much.

3615. Have you more or less cattle now upon your land than you had before 1865?—I had more land, consequently more cattle; but fewer

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

cattle in proportion to the extent of land, having stocked it more with sheep.

3616. Then you breed more animals per acre than you did before 1865?—No; I do not say that.

3617. I understood you to say that, proportionately, you had more cattle?—I have more land, and consequently more animals.

3618. Then the cattle plague of 1865 has not, in your own individual case, stopped your breeding of cattle or diminished it?—It did for a time, as I have stated. I had a farm which I had not one single animal upon, until I thought the disease was out of the country again.

3619. I understood you to say that not only had it done so at the time, but that you thought that the effect of it was still existing, and still diminishing the breeding of cattle?—People have got a little more confidence within the last two or three years with regard to cattle plague.

3620. All this was the effect of the cattle plague of 1865; do you think that the outbreak of cattle plague in 1872 had any effect in diminishing the quantity of cattle?—There was a considerable diminution at that time.

3621. The number of animals that died were not many; but do you think that the way in which the farmers were frightened, had any perceptible result in diminishing the number of cattle?—I believe the farmers would not buy cattle so freely as they would have done if that outbreak had not taken place.

3622. You remember the outbreak of 1872; do you think that that had any effect on your mind in the conduct of your own business?—No doubt. There is no outbreak of disease but what affected the mind of every farmer very severely.

3623. But do you sufficiently recollect your experience in 1872 to remember, whether the fact that there was some cattle plague in the East Riding did or did not cause you to breed less cattle in that year?—I do not think it did in that particular year.

3624. Take the outbreak of this year; do you think that it has had any effect on your trade in making you act differently from what you otherwise would have done?—There has not been time for it; we do not breed cattle in a week or in a month; we have to lay down a system to do it.

3625. I presume that you agree with most persons in supposing that the danger of that particular outbreak is very much removed; there has been no case for some time?—I shall be very glad if it is so.

3626. Do you think that the outbreak of cattle plague in the spring of this year, has at the present moment an influence on your mind to prevent your stocking your farm as usual?—It has this influence, that if I thought that there were not proper steps taken to protect the farming interest from cattle plague, I should reduce the quantity of cattle, and stock more with sheep. It is a wide question, but I think that it is just possible that the risk of it would be far more than the benefit of continuing it altogether.

3627. That is for the future; but does or does not what has actually happened this year operate upon your mind to prevent your buying stock?—Yes, it certainly does, and it has done so this spring.

Mr. *Rea.*

11 June 1877.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

3628. And in consequence of what has happened this spring you think you will probably breed less cattle this year than you did before?—If I had not been afraid of cattle plague this spring, in all probability I should have bought within the last three months a considerable number of cattle; but in place of that I have not bought one, excepting calves, from my immediate neighbours, where I knew that there was no risk.

3269. Whereas, last year at the same time, you did buy?—Yes.

3630. Now we will take foot-and-mouth disease. Happily you have not had very much experience yourself of foot-and-mouth disease?—I have had a good deal of experience of foot-and-mouth disease.

3631. You described one particular case, and you said that you had traced where the disease came from; where did it come from?—I bought the animals in a public market.

3632-3. What sort of animals were they?—Young cattle; year old cattle.

3634. You did not trace it any further to find out where it came from?—No. I bought them in the market, and I expected that they were clear of disease or I should not have bought them; but they came home, and the disease developed itself in a short time, and affected the other cattle.

3635. Do you recollect how long the restrictions lasted with regard to the markets, and the movement of cattle at the time of the cattle plague?—I could not say positively. I do not know exactly.

3636. It was some months, was it not?—Yes, it was some months, but I do not know the exact period.

3637. There was no attempt to escape from those restrictions in your neighbourhood, was there; did any of the farmers try to avoid the restrictions?—No, I do not think they did; there was no necessity for it. After inspection by an order, cattle were allowed to move within a certain radius.

3638. Did you not hear that in some parts of the kingdom there was a good deal of difficulty in carrying out the restrictions?—There was, of course, a good deal of inconvenience occasioned at times.

3639. I suppose at that time in Northumberland you knew what a terrible disease cattle plague was?—Yes.

3640. I understand that it is your opinion that the farming community would suffer as much inconvenience whatever it was, and for as great a length of time, in order to get rid of foot-and-mouth disease, as they did in order to get rid of cattle plague?—I think that they would submit to any fair regulation that was necessary to do that.

3641. Would they submit to as much?—Yes, they would submit to all reasonable restrictions.

3642. I am afraid that I must put it in the way that I did before; whether they would submit to as much restriction as they did with regard to cattle plague?—If it was necessary they would.

3643. They would only require to be convinced that it was necessary to submit to it?—Certainly.

3644. I understood you to say that you thought the higher prices that have ruled during the last few years were a good deal owing to the cattle plague of 1865?—I think that the cattle plague of 1865 had a tendency to raise the price of beef and mutton at that time, and it has continued more or less since.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

3645. Do you think that the cattle plague of 1865 has anything to do with the present price of beef and mutton?—I think that it has, to a certain extent.

Mr. *Wilbraham Egerton.*

3646. With regard to foot-and-mouth disease, are you in favour of greater restrictions than are at present carried out?—Yes; under proper form; under a universal form; but I think it is no good to restrict one place and not another where it has shown itself.

3647. Your point is that farmers would be willing to undergo more restrictions if foot-and-mouth disease were prevented from being imported from abroad?—If foot-and-mouth disease showed itself in a particular district, they would willingly submit to the necessary restrictions to stop it.

3648. You are aware, are you not, that many counties have not taken advantage of the Orders in Council by which they might have made greater restrictions on the movement of cattle than they have done?—I believe it is so; they might not think it necessary.

3649. As two or three years ago the farmers were in many cases not in favour of severe restriction being imposed on account of foot-and-mouth disease, do you think that their opinion has changed?—I think most decidedly so, if that was the case; but I am not aware that farmers were so much opposed to it as that dealers were opposed to it. I think that those men who dealt in cattle, and wanted to drive them about the country, were opposed to it, and not the farming interest.

3650. I argue that farmers were opposed to the restrictions because in many counties those restrictions were not strictly carried out. Are you in favour of the closing of fairs and markets for foot-and-mouth disease?—If there is disease about the district, of course I think that they should be closed.

3651. Are you prepared to advocate the closing of all fairs and markets in any county where foot-and-mouth disease exists?—For a time, because otherwise you are disseminating the disease.

3652. That has never been done hitherto, has it?—No; I think that that is a question that ought to be left for the orders of the Privy Council by their inspectors.

3653. But the orders of the Privy Council are not at present compulsory; are you in favour of compulsory orders throughout the kingdom?—Certainly.

3654. Wherever foot-and-mouth disease breaks out?—Yes; I am in favour of an universal plan to check it. I am in favour of the Order coming from the Privy Council, and I think that their inspectors should have the power to say that within the district no cattle should be moved.

3655. You are in favour of vesting all the responsibility and all the power in the Privy Council, and taking it away from the local authority?—Yes.

3656. You

Sir *Rainald Knightley.*

3656. You said, I think, as everybody knows, that the slaughter of cattle in 1866 and 1867 by diminishing the supply increased the price of meat?—I think so.

3657. You are aware, are you not, that that disease attacked breeding cows especially?—Yes.

3658. And therefore by that cause the supply of cattle was diminished not only for that year, but for several years to come?—No doubt of it.

3659. And therefore the loss to the farmers, and to the community generally, was not confined to those two years, but extended over several subsequent years?—No doubt of it.

Mr. *Jacob Bright.*

3660. I understand that you consider that at present the farmer is not enough protected in regard to diseases of cattle; is that so?—Yes.

3661. You wish him to be more protected than he is in that respect?—The farmer considers that cattle plague and other diseases have been imported, and he thinks that he has a fair right to ask to be protected from disease being imported.

3662. Will you tell me in what way you would establish more protection than you have at present?—In the first place, by prohibiting the importation of foreign cattle, and then in the next place, that if an outbreak takes place there should be a distinct and universal order to prohibit and check the movement of cattle within an infected district, and not as it has been that one local authority orders one thing, and another local authority upsets it. As it has been, one local authority has allowed cattle to be taken from one county into another, and the next local authority has not allowed it to be done; and there has not been the universal regularity that is necessary, I think, to check the disease.

3663. Then do I correctly understand that you consider that the farmers can only be properly protected, by absolutely shutting out all foreign cattle?—I think that it is a step very well worth trying, and I think it is the first step that would protect them.

3664. You think that without that there can be no proper protection?—I am afraid not; I do not see it.

3665. When you speak of shutting out foreign cattle, do you include Irish cattle?—No; I should simply leave Ireland as part of England.

3666. You would let them send over diseased cattle?—I should prohibit Ireland from importing foreign cattle, and I should use the same restrictions in Ireland as we do in England

3667. You say that you have land in Lancashire?—Yes.

3668. Probably you will know something of the people in Lancashire?—A little, not very much.

3669. If you were to shut out all foreign cattle from this country, do you think that nothing would be said in a great county like Lancashire; do you think that the people would bear it very peaceably?—I may be wrong, but it is my opinion that the introduction of the disease into England has done more to raise the price of beef, and to reduce the quantity of beef, than the introduction of foreign cattle has ever done

Mr. *Jacob Bright*—continued.

to reduce the price of it. I think that the introduction of disease has decreased the quantity of beef.

3670. Are you not aware that we had disease before we had trade in cattle from abroad?—Which disease?

3671. Various diseases; I suppose foot-and-mouth disease, at any rate, and pleuro-pneumonia. Had we not those diseases before the importation of foreign cattle?—I cannot answer that question.

3672. You never understood that in 1841 and in 1842, before free trade in cattle, we had diseases amongst our own cattle in this country?—I suppose that our cattle are subject to certain diseases, more or less.

3673. If they are subject to certain diseases, may they not be subject to foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia?—It may be so; I have not sufficient experience to say that.

3674. With regard to cattle plague, I suppose since the great outbreak of 1865, when we had no means of protection, because we had no legal powers then to interfere, we have had scarcely any cattle plague in this country; is it not so?—I think that with the exception of a little outbreak in 1872, there has not been so much.

3675. Have you not heard it said that the actual direct cost (I am not now speaking of the inconvenience that the farmers suffer) to the country since the outbreak of 1875 has not been perhaps more than 20,000 *l.*?—The country would submit to the cost of it much more readily if they were satisfied that means were taken to prevent it; and I am of opinion that the best means to prevent it is to prohibit the introduction of foreign cattle. I think the country would submit to the cost with greater willingness if that were done.

3676. Do you think that the people would be willing that a considerable per-centage of their whole supply of meat should be shut out in the hope that you might, but not with the certainty that you would, get rid of some of these diseases?—I suppose the people would not like to be without their food, but I do not apprehend any such thing. I think that we are capable of feeding more cattle in England, if we could go on with greater freedom; and if the evidence from America is anything like correct, we may look for such a supply of dead meat from America as will go far to make up any deficiency that may be experienced.

3677. Do you not think that people will not only want the dead meat, but the live meat also?—We have live meat in England.

3678. But I mean the live meat from abroad?—I do not think that they will; if it is shown that the dead meat is brought in in such quantities.

3679. What we want is abundance of food, and it is desirable to have meat at a moderate price?—Why not kill them and bring them as carcases? I should not prohibit their sending as much dead meat as they choose. What we want is to give every opportunity to all countries to send in dead meat, but we want to prohibit the chance of the disease coming. We want a fair field; we are not afraid of opposition, but only of disease being imported.

3680. Have you not heard it said that a cry might be raised even to shut out the dead meat,

Mr. *Rea.*

11 June 1877.

Mr. *Jacob Bright*—continued.

on the ground that it would introduce the disease as well as the live cattle?—I have not heard that.

3681. Should you be surprised to know that we have received evidence, that the day may come when we may require dead meat to be shut out also, lest it should produce disease?—I think it will be time enough to raise that question when there is any chance of its doing so. I have not heard of its doing so.

3682. Is it not a fact that dead meat from Germany is now shut out, as well as live cattle?—I am not aware that it is.

Mr. *Elliot.*

3683. When did the importation begin from the Continent?—I cannot carry the dates in my mind.

3684. Do you know when the first outbreak of cattle plague in England was?—I think it was in 1865.

3685. Was that imported?—It has always been understood so; there was no doubt that it was imported. I suppose that that has been proved.

Mr. *Ritchie.*

3686. When you speak about your belief that the people of this country would be willing to bear whatever restrictions might be necessary to keep out the cattle plague, and that with that object they would consent to the keeping out of live meat, do you mean the consumer or the farmer?—I speak more of the farming interest.

3687. Not so much of the consuming interest as of the farming interest?—I hold that by doing away with the risk of disease we should produce more beef in England, and supply the public better of course.

3688. Do you know what proportion of its meat London derives from abroad?—No, I do not.

3689. Have you any doubt that the prohibition of the importation of live animals would, at any rate, immediately have an effect upon the price of meat?—I do not see why it should, if they have dead meat.

3690. Do you believe that the importation of dead meat would be as large as the present importation of live meat?—I think that if we are to believe part of the evidence that I heard the other day it would be very much more.

3691. Would it come into operation immediately?—From what I have heard I think that within the last 20 weeks it seemed to be an increase of about 60 or 70 per cent., if I speak correctly.

3692. That is with reference to the importation of American meat. Our present supply from the Continent is altogether live animals; do you believe that if that supply were prohibited we should get immediately from the Continent the same supply of dead meat as we are now getting in live animals?—I think that they would very quickly find out the means of sending it dead if they were prohibited from sending it alive.

3693. Would not that take some time?—It might take a few weeks; it does not take long to slaughter an animal and send it across.

3694. Have you heard the evidence as to whether or not that would be a profitable thing

Mr. *Ritchie*—continued.

for the exporters on the Continent?—I am not at all prepared to give evidence about that. I do not know the relative cost of dead and live meat, but I should naturally say that the cost of bringing a carcase would be less in proportion than the cost of bringing a live animal.

3695. It would resolve itself, after all, I suppose, into a question of whether it paid the exporter on the Continent?—Yes, I should think so.

3696. But if it did not pay the exporter to send the dead meat here, it probably would not come at present?—Quite so.

3697. And if we did not receive such a supply, the immediate effect would be a large increase in the price to the consumer in London?—They are not sending it dead now, but I think, if they were prevented from sending it alive, they would very soon send it dead, if it suited their purpose; and it would suit their purpose if this was their best market.

3698. But we have it in evidence from these exporters from the Continent that it would not pay them; if that were the case, I suppose you would say that the prohibition of the importation of live animals would materially affect the price here?—If it were so it might, but I do not see why it should be so.

3699. I think you said that the farmers were desirous of being protected from cattle plague and other diseases being imported; which do you think the farmers suffer more from in this country, cattle plague or pleuro-pneumonia?—I do not know. I suppose they suffer very much from pleuro-pneumonia in some districts and from cattle plague in other districts.

3700. Do you know whether, taking your own view, that the diseases have an effect upon the breeding of stock; pleuro-pneumonia is more to be dreaded by the farmer than cattle plague?—I should say cattle plague was more to be dreaded.

3701. Is not pleuro-pneumonia always more or less in existence?—I am not aware that it is. I do not think that necessarily it is more or less in existence if proper means are taken. I never had pleuro-pneumonia.

3702. In answer to a previous question, you stated, did you not, that you were not prepared to say that pleuro-pneumonia was an imported disease?—I do not pretend to say, and I will not give an opinion, but I have always understood that it was.

3703. But I think I understood you to say that that was not of your own knowledge?—Not of my knowledge; I have been reasonably free from it, but I have always understood that it was imported.

Mr. *Pease.*

3704. Your great object in keeping out foreign cattle is to keep English herds free from disease?—Quite so.

3705. Have you heard the evidence which has been given as to the state of the cattle in Denmark and Schleswig-Holstein, that they are practically free from disease?—I think I heard that stated here on Friday.

3706. Supposing it to be the case that they are free from disease, would you prohibit their coming in?—I think so, as we have no control beyond

Mr. *Pease*—continued.

beyond that; we have no reason to know that diseased animals may not come there.

3707. Supposing that we were certified that Schleswig was free from disease in the same way as we could be certified that Aberdeenshire was free from disease, would you object any more to Schleswig cattle coming in than to Aberdeenshire cattle coming in?—I should, for the simple reason that we have command over the one and not over the other.

3708. Would that be your only reason?—I do not know that that would be my only reason, but it would be a strong reason; we should be left very much at the mercy of the foreign inspectors.

3709. And you do not trust the foreign inspectors as you do your own?—We ought not to.

3710. Supposing that you had your own inspector in Schleswig or in Denmark, would you then object?—I would.

3711. Do you merely object because the inspector is a foreigner?—I think that we should still run greater risk by any animals from the Continent.

3712. If your Englishman in Denmark certified that the cattle were free from disease, and your Englishman in Aberdeenshire certified the same thing, what would be the difference of risk?—I think it has been shown that cattle imported have very often not shown that disease until they were landed in England.

3713. Might not the same thing take place with the Aberdeenshire cattle?—If it were possible it could not continue.

3714. Why not?—Because they would be at once stopped.

3715. Could not the Schleswig cattle be stopped in the same way?—I do not know; I should not have the same confidence.

Mr. *Chamberlain.*

3716. You say that the farmers would be willing to submit to any regulations that were proved to be necessary in order to stamp out pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease?—Yes.

3717. Professor Brown stated that it would be essential in order that those diseases should be stamped out, that the movement of animals should be entirely prohibited in the district in which disease exists; do you think that that is a necessary regulation?—I think that where disease is, certainly they ought to be prevented from moving the animals.

3718. From moving them out of the whole district in which the disease is certified to exist?—That is for the inspectors to say.

3719. Do you think that the farmers would submit to anything that the inspectors thought necessary?—I think so, if they were reasonable persons.

3720. I think you said that when you had foot-and-mouth disease in your district you were allowed to move healthy animals with a pass?—Yes; I was speaking more of cattle plague at the time.

3721. I understood from Professor Brown that he would not allow any movement even of healthy animals, if he were attempting to stamp out disease?—If they had been in contact with unhealthy animals, I think that he would be quite right to prohibit them; I am not prepared to say where the limit is.

Mr. *Chamberlain*—continued.

3722. You would not pronounce any opinion as to whether the farmers would submit to such an extreme regulation as that?—They would submit to any regulation that was fairly necessary to check, and put down those diseases.

3723. But do you consider that those particular regulations are fairly necessary?—I must ask you whether you would take them within a radius of half a mile or a mile, or 100 miles, or how far.

3724. I think that Professor Brown proposed to divide England into 2,000 districts, with an inspector in each?—What extent would each district be?

3725. I do not know over how many miles it would extend, but it is suggested that it would be an average of seven parishes. Leaving that, supposing that, by means of these regulations they were successful in stamping out the disease for a time, might it not be re-introduced, or might it not even occur spontaneously from carelessness in the management of cattle?—That I do not know; we know that these diseases are infectious.

3726. But without infection might not pleuro-pneumonia, which is a lung disease, break out amongst cattle if they were improperly treated?—It might be so, but I never had it, and I have never had foot-and-mouth disease without being able to trace the origin of it.

3727. Have you ever heard of foot-and-mouth disease arising from bad treatment?—No.

3728. From cattle being kept in crowded or ill-ventilated sheds?—Cattle and sheep are subject to a disease called foot-rot, but that has nothing to do with foot-and-mouth disease.

3729. I think it has been stated in evidence that those diseases do arise, in towns, at all events, from bad treatment?—I suppose if an animal is confined in a place without pure air he suffers much in the same way as a human being would; but I do not apprehend that that is a thing which could be looked upon as very likely to occur.

3730. If that be so you would be subject to have those restrictions re-imposed upon you owing to carelessness or bad management of some farmer in the neighbourhood?—I think that they would willingly run the risk of that. There is a necessary and proper discretion to be applied in all those cases.

3731. You think then, on the whole, that the farmers would trust to the discretion of the inspectors?—I think so, if the system were fairly administered.

Mr. *Cameron of Lochiel.*

3732. I suppose these diseases which the honourable Member has just referred to, which are produced by bad treatment, can scarcely be classed as contagious diseases?—I do not class them as such.

3733. Therefore they would hardly come under the category of those diseases to which you referred in your former answer?—Certainly not.

3734. You are in favour of the total prohibition

Mr. *Rea.*

11 June 1877.

Mr. *Cameron of Lochiel*—continued.

tion of the importation of animals from the Continent?—Yes, precisely.

3735. You would make no exception at all?—I would make no exception at all, simply because I think that we cannot be certain without total prohibition.

3736. You think that the existing regulations could not be modified in any manner, so as to lessen the risk of importing animals from the Continent, without going the extreme length of altogether prohibiting importation?—I am not prepared to say that; I did not think that we could with safety admit them, and more than that, I do not see any reason why we should run the risk, when it is proved that we can have as much dead meat as will supply any number of people.

3737. I gather from your answers to an honourable Member, that you consider that the appointment of English inspectors in foreign ports would be attended with considerable difficulties, and that you do not see your way to making that a sufficient safeguard against the importation of disease?—I think that it would be only letting in one end of the wedge; I should be certainly opposed to that.

3738. With regard to the possibility of excluding dead meat from this country, in consequence of there being a chance of the dead meat conveying disease, you have never heard that suggested?—Never.

3739. Are you aware that dead meat is imported entirely now from America, and that they have no disease in America?—I believe they have not.

3740. And, of course, in order to bring disease over by means of dead meat, it would be necessary that the disease should exist in the country from which the dead meat came?—Unquestionably.

3741. Do you consider that there is any possibility of animals having the cattle plague, or the germs of the disease being taken to America, so as to produce the disease there?—I suppose they might import the disease, but I believe they are most arbitrary in their restrictions.

3742. Is it within the bounds of possibility, that the Americans would import live cattle into their Continent from Russia or from Germany?—I should think that they would be too much alive to their own interests to do so. I suppose that if a man wanted to take the disease to America, he could do it; but I think that it is most unlikely.

3743. With the exception of importing very high-bred short-horned bulls or other animals for the purpose of breeding, there is no importation of live animals, is there, from the Continent to America?—No.

3744. Therefore is it not impossible that the disease should exist in America and be brought to this country by mean of the dead-meat trade?—It is practically impossible.

Mr. *French.*

3745. You say that the farmers would be willing to stand any restrictions which were thought necessary in order to stamp out foot-and-mouth disease?—Yes.

3746. Do you think that the consumers of meat would be willing to stand the high price of meat which those restrictions would produce?—I think that it is not fair to say that restrictions would raise the price of meat.

Mr. *French*—continued.

3747. Do you not think that stopping the importation of continental cattle would raise the price of meat?—No, I think that we shall have beef lower in price if they follow out this dead-meat trade.

3748. You think that there is a sufficient quantity of beef in America, which is not required for their own use, to enable them to supply the increased demand which would be caused by stopping the importation of foreign cattle into England?—All the evidence given here tends to show that they have an almost unlimited supply.

3749. Is not the great supply of meat in America at present more or less produced by the depression of trade there?—No doubt that may be so to a certain extent; but I think that while it pays them better to send it to England they will continue to send it; and their resources appear to me to be so great that it will be a very long time before there is any risk of a deficiency in the supply of dead meat. It has been satisfactorily shown that it can be brought in good order and in good condition, and I do not think that there is a shadow of a chance that for a very long time there can be any deficiency in the supply of dead meat from America, always assuming that they have established the fact that they can supply it in good order, and that they are paid for it. If our markets dropped very low from the fact of our own supply being great, and if it did not pay the American to send it, he would not send it; but that would only arise from a very great drop in the price of butchers' meat in England.

3750. How many years do you think it would take to increase our own supply, so as to make up for the deficiency caused by the prohibition of live meat coming in at present from the Continent?—It would require time, but I think the American supply is increasing as fast as it is wanted.

3751. How many years do you think it would take us to increase the number of our own stock so as to be more or less independent of the American trade?—We should want two or three years to do it; but there is nothing in my mind to lead me to suppose that if you prohibit the Continent from sending in live stock, they will not send in dead meat. How is it sent from Aberdeen? I do not see any reason why it cannot be sent from any part of the Continent quite as readily as from Aberdeen.

3752. You think that it might be sent from countries on the Continent?—I see no reason why it should not.

3753. Is it not more difficult for them to get ice on the Continent than in America?—I suppose that they can get it.

3754. Did you hear the evidence of some of the gentlemen from those countries here, who say that it would so diminish the profits which they at present obtain, that they would be obliged to give up the trade if they had to send in their meat as dead meat?—I should not think so; I do not know. But why should we run a risk. I think that we ought to look to our home supply.

3755. But we should not receive that supply at

Mr. *French*—continued.

at all either as dead meat or as live stock?—I cannot see any reason why we should not receive it. They are increasing their breeding every year, and what will they do with it?

3756. They say that if the importation into this country were stopped they would be obliged to change their system of farming; if we were entirely dependent upon American meat, contingencies such as rough weather might leave the country very short of supply now and then, might they not?—I should think that rough weather would affect live cattle very much more than dead meat.

3757. But the distance would be so much shorter from the Continent than from America that they would not feel it so much?—But why should they send over live animals from America; why not continue the system which seems to have been adopted, and which answers very well.

3758. But in case of rough weather that dead meat might be so long in coming that if we were entirely dependent in our markets upon that supply, perhaps we might run very short indeed?—I think that is rather supposing a contingency which is not likely to happen; rough weather might delay a vessel a day or two, but it would not be all in one vessel or on one line. There will be many lines established, I have no doubt, to convey the American meat here, and it will become a system, and they may arrange it so as to supply the English market from more ports than one.

Mr. *John Holms.*

3759. I think that the evidence which you give goes to show that in your opinion we should entirely close the ports against the introduction of any live cattle?—Yes.

3760. And you feel that if the ports are so closed you are capable of extending your breeding in this country to such an extent as to make up for that deficiency?—I think so.

3761. Your trade has been extending lately year by year very much, has it not?—I do not quite say that; but I think there is no doubt that it would extend if we felt full security.

3762. Taking the last ten years, has not the breeding trade of this country very greatly increased?—I think so.

3763. It has increased in the face of the importation of live cattle?—I think so, although I believe that at the present moment there are fewer cattle in England than there have been for some time.

3764. Supposing that the ports were closed, that would not protect you, would it, from pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease?—I think that it would go very far to do so; I think that we should be able to battle with it if the ports were closed.

3765. You have just stated to an honourable Member that, in your opinion, the disease in your flocks will be inherent in them for generations?—No; the weakness from the effects of the disease.

3766. Could you tell the Committee what was the price of meat before the outbreak of cattle plague in 1865?—I suppose that it might range from 6 *d.* to 6½ *d.* per lb., but I do not know with certainty. I am giving a rough estimate.

3767. What would you say was the average price last year?—Since then it has risen very considerably. I should take it on an average that the price has been from 8 *d.* to 9 *d.* per lb.

Mr. *John Holms*—continued.

3768. Would not the direct effect of closing the ports just now be immediately to raise the price, because you say that it would take some time before the American meat could come in any quantity?—I do not think so; I think that the American meat is coming in in such quantity that it seems to meet a great deal of the deficiency.

3769. Would not the immediate effect of closing the ports now against the importation of live cattle be considerably to increase the price?—It might for a week or two, from a sort of terror and dread of its doing so.

Mr. *Anderson.*

3770. You want to stop the importation of live cattle entirely, as a permanent measure, do you, and not merely as a temporary measure?—Yes, if it is found to answer; I think that that is the first thing that we ought to do to protect England from disease.

3771. That would apply not only to the importation of fat cattle for slaughtering, but also to the importation of young stock and store cattle, and milch cows, would it not?—Certainly.

3772. At present young stock and store cattle, and milch cows, come in, to a certain extent, do they not?—I believe they do.

3773. And the farmers buy them?—They are rather foolish if they do, but I suppose some farmers must buy them.

3774. Supposing that they were no longer imported, where would those farmers get them from?—They would have to depend more upon England and upon Ireland, where there are cattle bred in great quantities.

3775. Why are they not dependent upon England and Ireland for them at present?—I think that they are in a great measure. I do not think that many young cattle are imported.

3776. Are there not many milch cows imported?—If they are I think it is a great pity, because I think the disease comes from them, to a certain extent.

3777. To whatever extent they come in the farmers would be obliged to trust more to English breeders, would they not, for the supply of those cattle?—No doubt those who depend upon that for their supply would simply breed more themselves.

3778. They do not breed more themselves at present because they can get them cheaper from abroad, I presume?—Exactly.

3779. Therefore, if you prohibited the import of live cattle the farmers who trust to buying them at present would have more to pay for them?—The farmer would breed them himself.

3780. But he does not breed them himself because he can buy them cheaper than he can breed them?—I think that it is only a drop in the bucket.

3781. Do you yourself breed only for the butcher?—Only for the butcher.

3782. You sell no young stock?—No, I sell no young stock.

3783. I think

Mr. *Rea.*

11 June 1877.

Mr. *Read.*

11 June 1877.

Colonel *Kingscote.*

3783. I think in answer to a question of the right honourable gentleman, the Member for Bradford, you misunderstood him, and therefore I will repeat the question; during the last ten or twelve years you have not bred so much stock as you would have bred otherwise, from fear of disease?—Certainly.

3784. You bought in a great many more; but if you had thought that you had been free from disease, you would have bred more?—Quite so.

3785. And that has been money out of your pocket to a large extent?—No doubt of it.

3786. And in the end, out of the pocket of the consumer; because if you had been able to breed those cattle you would have been able at equal profit to sell meat at a cheaper rate?—It must be a reasonable conclusion that, where a farmer has the opportunity and the means of breeding and rearing his cattle from first to last, he not only has a better profit, but the community are more cheaply served than if the cattle have to pass through so many hands.

3787. Understanding that you farm largely in Scotland, Northumberland, and again in Lancashire, could you not, if there were not so many restrictions upon the movement of cattle, consequent upon disease, at greater profit to yourself bring your cattle gradually down from Scotland to these low country farms and fatten them, and sell them to the public at much less cost?—No doubt. The fewer hands the cattle go through the less it must cost. If there were no middle men more of the profit would go into the hands of the farmer; and not only that, but there would be comparatively no deterioration of the stock from their going to the market and being knocked about the country. They are stopped in their growth and condition for weeks by being knocked about the country in different markets.

3788. Therefore it is that you advocate the endeavour to stamp out foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia by the authority of the Privy Council over those local authorities?—Yes.

3789. Because you believe that it would be efficacious, and you also believe that the farmers would submit to these restrictions?—I think so.

Mr. *Arthur Peel.*

3790. Of course you would prohibit the import of all live animals from a country where cattle plague existed?—I should prohibit the import of all live animals from countries where cattle plague existed.

3791. Supposing that the cattle plague had ceased in that foreign country, so far as all reasonable suspicion went, should you have any objection to introduce cattle from that country and slaughter them at the port of arrival?—Yes, I should.

3792. Supposing, further, that it was known that no disease at all existed in that foreign country, should you object to live imports coming into this country, after the inspector had been on board, and after the cattle had been kept in quarantine for a certain number of hours?—I think that that would be much too uncertain to run the risk of.

3793. In short, you object to the present classification of the countries, as scheduled and

Mr. *Arthur Peel*—continued.

unscheduled countries?—Quite so; I do not think that we should have security from that measure.

3794. And you think that no precautions, however wise or prudent, can guard us against the importation of disease?—I do not think that it is in our power to do so.

Mr. *Chaplin.*

3795. You consider that, at present, the breeders of cattle in England have not proper security?—I do.

3796. And in order to get that proper security, I understand that you could recommend not only the prohibition of the importation of live cattle from the Continent, but that the Privy Council should supersede the local authority?—Yes.

3797. Do you mean by that at all times, or only in cases of outbreaks of disease?—I think that it should be so arranged that the Privy Council should have an universal plan to follow out in the whole kingdom; that if an outbreak occurs their inspector should have power to use such measures as he may think fit, and to take such an area as he feels satisfied will prevent the dissemination of the disease.

3798. But in the case of an outbreak, those powers, you think, ought to be compulsory?—Unquestionably.

3799. Supposing that those two remedies were adopted, and that you had the security that you desire, it would, in your opinion, I suppose, largely increase the amount of home-bred cattle?—I think it would.

3800. To an extent sufficient to compensate us for the loss of the foreign live cattle?—I think so. I think that the introduction of disease from foreign cattle has perhaps tended so much to the diminution of the quantity of meat and to the rise of the price, as to counter-balance any benefit that has arisen from the importation of foreign cattle.

3801. Are you aware that we have had evidence to the effect that we can have an unlimited supply of good meat from America in perfect condition at all times of the year?—I am aware of that.

3802. In answer to the honourable Member for Hackney I understood you to say that the direct effect of prohibiting the importation of live cattle from the Continent would be to immediately increase the price of meat in this country?—It might be so for a week or two, but it could not be for very long if the Americans have the quantity of meat that we are led to believe; and everybody must suffer in some degree to gain a perfect end.

3803. Then taking the supply of American meat into account, if we entirely stopped the importation of live cattle from the Continent, and thereby obtained a largely increased home supply, what do you think would be the ultimate effect on the price of meat in England; would it tend to lower or to increase the price?—That is rather a wide question to answer. It would depend very much upon the supply from America. If they can at all fulfil what they say now it would lower it, no doubt.

3804. But you could not rely upon the increase in home-bred cattle to lower the price at all?—I think that we have power to increase the breed of

Mr. *Chaplin*—continued.

of cattle in England very much now with the introduction of artificial food, which every one is becoming more alive to; and I think that if cattle got above a certain price per pound, and artificial food was at a reasonable price, men who have it in their power would increase the growth of cattle in England so long as it was at a price to pay them.

3805. On the whole, then, are you of opinion that to prohibit importation from the Continent would be a benefit or a loss to the country?—I think that it would be a benefit.

Chairman.

3806. In answer to the right honourable gentleman the Member for Bradford, you stated

Chairman—continued.

that the cattle plague of 1865 had to a certain extent to do with the present price; what I infer that you meant was, that in consequence of that malady being then introduced, a very large diminution in the breeding of cattle had taken place in the country?—No doubt of it.

3807. And that where formerly there were large breeding herds, now the people with the small amount of cattle they have, get lean stock from Ireland and fatten them off quickly in consequence of their dread of this disease?—Yes, I think so; they lessen their risk.

3808. And that the reduction in the breeding herds of the country, practically implied a less supply and therefore affected the present price?—I think so.

Mr. *Rea.*

11 June 1877.

Wednesday, 13th June 1877.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Major Allen.
Mr. Anderson.
Mr. Assheton.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Cameron of Lochiel.
Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. James Corry.
Mr. Dease.
Mr. Elliot.
Mr. W. E. Forster.
Mr. French.
Mr. John Holms.
Mr. King-Harman.
Colonel Kingscote.
Mr. M'Lagan.
Mr. Torr.
Mr. Murphy.
Mr. Norwood.
Mr. Arthur Peel.
Mr. Ritchie.
Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON, IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. CHARLES LENNOX PEEL, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

Mr. *Peel.* 13 June 1877.

3809. I UNDERSTAND you to be prepared now to put in the Orders that were mentioned the last time you were examined before this Committee, and an analysis of those Orders as was suggested by the right honourable gentleman the Member for Bradford?—I have put in all the Orders in Council that have been passed since the Committee sat in 1873, with the exception of a few that merely altered defined parts of ports, and declared infected places. The analysis that is asked for is the analysis of regulations which has been made by local authorities under the Cattle Plague Order of this year, which I hand in with a specimen of each kind of Order.

Chairman—continued.

3810. These really give a fair sketch of the whole proceedings of the Privy Council dealing with these diseases?—Certainly, since the sitting of the Committee of 1873.

3811. Showing where the Orders come into effect also in the local districts?—Yes; these Orders include those that I put in the other day; this is a complete set.

3812. It shows also when the Orders that were made expired?—Yes.

3813. In fact, it is a complete history of the action of the Privy Council in regard to cattle plague?—Quite so. (*The Papers were delivered in,* see *Appendix.*)

Mr. SEPTIMUS LAMBERT, junior, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

Mr. *Lambert.*

3814. I BELIEVE that you are a Cattle Salesman in Manchester, engaged very largely in the cattle trade?—I am.

3815. Have you been for any length of time in that trade?—For 20 years.

3816. From that experience, you can speak of the trade that has existed during that time?—Yes.

3817. Has your attention been called to the introduction of the dead-meat trade from America?—Yes.

3818. Have you yourself attempted to go into that trade at all?—No.

3819. Has it come under your knowledge so that you are able to tell the Committee from experience what your opinion of it is?—Yes.

3820. Are there any depôts in Manchester which deal exclusively with that trade?—Yes.

3821. How many are there?—I think there were about 18 altogether.

3822. Have those been established there for any length of time?—About seven months.

3823. They did not begin that trade, then, in Manchester at the time that they first imported American dead meat into Liverpool?—No.

Chairman—continued.

3824. Is the trade in dead meat a large one in Manchester?—It was.

3825. At what time?—In the cold weather, during the months of January, February, and March.

3826. That is to say until very recently it was an increasing trade?—Until within the last three months.

3827. Do you mean that it began to fall off as a trade in the months of April and May and the present month?—Yes.

3828. Up to that time can you give the Committee any idea of the quantities that were imported into Manchester for sale?—I cannot.

3829. You yourself have not dealt in that particular branch of the trade, and therefore you can only speak from general observation of the fact that it has been carried on, and that, in your opinion, it has diminished recently?—Yes.

3830. Are you able to speak as to the condition in which that meat has arrived at Manchester?

Chairman—continued.

chester?—During the cold weather it arrived in good condition.

3831. The first cargoes of it, when it came over in the winter, were able to compete fairly in the market with the English supply?—Yes.

3832. Can you speak as to the quality of the meat that then arrived?—The quality was very mixed; some lots were mixed; some was very good, and some was very inferior indeed.

3833. Were you able to judge of whether the different qualities came in the same cargo, or whether they formed parts of different cargoes?—I examined carcases of meat in the different stores in Manchester, and I found that some of them were bulls, some old cows, and some of them bullocks.

3834. What you mean is that they had sent over a mixed lot of cattle?—Yes.

3835. And the difference in quality arose from that, and not from any deterioration in the meat?—Not in the cold weather.

3836. Since the hot weather came, has there been much of this American meat condemned in Manchester?—Most of the stores have been closed lately in Manchester. The principal store in Cross-street Manchester, was, after an attempt to form it into a limited liability company had failed, was advertised, and sold by auction, with the fittings and fixtures last Friday week.

3837. Was that store established by the importers of the dead meat into the country, or by a private company, who, seeing this trade commencing, thought that they would avail themselves of it?—By a private company.

3838. This one out of the 18 places where the meat has been sold, as I understand you, has already become bankrupt?—Not bankrupt, but it has closed; and this company is the owner of most of the 18 stores in Manchester.

3839. You put that before the Committee as showing that they have found the trade falling off, and that fewer outlets were sufficient for it?—Yes, the excitement of the Amerian meat trade has quite died away, and people are altogether ceasing to eat it in Manchester. Hotels and restaurants never gave a second order for it.

3840. And yet you describe the meat when it arrives in fair condition, as it did for a considerable number of months, as competing fairly with the English supply?—When the first excitement was on about it, people rushed in to eat it, but when they had once tasted it, they did not want it any more.

3841. Have you had any personal experience of it?—No.

3842. You do not speak as other witnesses have done from having tasted it, and finding that when it got cold it was not so good?—I have heard everyone say that when it is cold, it has no taste at all.

3843. You were not present during the examination of the witnesses the other day, I think?—No.

3844. A witness who is a butcher in London, stated in evidence before this Committee, that a very considerable proportion of the meat supplied in the west end of town was American meat supplied as English meat; and he stated that no complaints had come from any of the customers where that meat had been so supplied, showing that at all events the cargoes that were sent to London had not been so flavourless or so different in their quality as you represent them to have been in Manchester?—That would be in the cold weather.

Chairman—continued.

3845. That took place during the months of May and June, the present month; that is his experience, speaking as a practical man in the trade in London; but that is not your experience of what has taken place in Manchester?—It is not. In London, American beef has been sold as low as 3 *d.* per lb. in those months.

3846. It has been stated also in evidence here by importers, that the reason of a very large portion of the supply that has come over having deteriorated in quality, and not standing the change of atmosphere so well, has been the fact that they are at present experimenting rather than sending a steady trade, in order to see how closely they can pack, to what extent they can do away with ice and the other adjuncts, so as to get the meat over in the cheapest possible form; do you believe that that may be the reason why the Manchester supply has fallen off in quality?—No. I have had great experience of the meat trade, and I think that meat can never be moved after it has been in ice. Meat decomposes rapidly after having been subjected to the action of ice.

3847. Are you aware of the method by which this meat is brought over to this country?—Yes, I have read of it.

3848. Are you aware that, being in ice, as you have described, is not part of that method?—It is subjected to the action of ice; I know that it is not in ice.

3849. Are you aware that it is stated that the meat is never, either by being placed in contact with ice, or by being in the atmosphere which the ice affects, brought below a temperature of 34° or 36°, and that therefore it is never frozen?—34°, I believe, is the lowest.

3850. Therefore the meat is never really brought into a freezing condition?—No.

3851. Are you aware that the process is to chill it steadily through, so as to get out the animal heat, and that the statement is that, that having been done and the meat having been so prepared, it takes longer to decompose that meat when it is exposed to the air than it does to decompose a fresh killed animal?—That has to be proved. The Manchester inspector of meat seized only last Friday 24 quarters of American beef recently landed.

3852. But you have no means of telling this Committee whether that formed a portion of a cargo which had been generally condemned, or whether it was part of a cargo of which other parts were in good condition?—Some parts he told me were in good condition, and some parts in bad condition.

3853. I want to get what your own opinion is with regard to this point. Supposing that the trade becomes a sufficiently remunerative one, to induce them to send over a really prime quality of meat such as has been stated to arrive, instead of what I understand you to say was a mixed sort of lot in which old cows and bulls and bullocks were mixed up together, do you believe that that would be equally distasteful to the public?—I do not believe that American meat can ever be sent over to be sold except it is sold within two days after it arrives. All people who have stores in Manchester have told me that unless it is sold in two days, the gravy runs from it, and it changes colour and has the appearance of smothered beef, and the people will not buy it.

3854. How

Mr. *Lambert.*

13 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

3854. How long is it exposed on the railroad after it has been removed from the cold air chambers of the ship in which it travels?—To get to Manchester it would take 12 hours at least.

3855. Therefore, that means that after it has been three days out of the atmosphere in which it is brought over, it will not stand competition with English killed meat?—No.

3856. You speak of that more from hearsay than from experience, do you not?—I speak from noticing the beef, and from the experience of men who are in the trade.

3857. And of people who have those stores in Manchester?—Yes.

3858. But you are not able to say whether, as has been stated to the Committee, the worst parts of the cargoes which have come over to Liverpool, which they could not sell, or thought they could not sell at the port, have been forwarded to other places for the purpose of getting a market for it; you have had no direct consignment of a whole cargo to Manchester, have you?—No.

3859. You do not think that the supply which has been sold in Manchester may be in some way similarly affected to that which has been described as being sold in London; that is to say, a supply which, from the want of preparation or from competition in the way of cheapening the transit, did not arrive at Liverpool in the best condition; and that they kept at Liverpool, or at the port of arrival, the best parts of the cargo, and anything that they thought was not likely to sell well, they sent forward into the country?—The Manchester buyers go down to Liverpool and buy it themselves from the agents.

3860. Purchasing it themselves out of the cargoes?—Yes.

3861. From that, I suppose that you would consider that this dead-meat trade cannot be a permanent trade competing with the trade in live animals killed in this country?—Certainly not.

3862. Have you dealt at all with the import of foreign cattle?—We import a great many foreign sheep to Manchester every season.

3863. That import is at present very much limited, I presume, in consequence of the slaughtering at Deptford?—The foreign cattle and sheep for Manchester are slaughtered at Sunderland, West Hartlepool, and the east ports.

3864. Those animals that came from Germany, as you are probably aware, are slaughtered at the port of London?—Yes.

3865. Has that continued from the beginning of the cattle plague breaking out?—Yes.

3866. That is a period of nearly three months, is it not?—More, I believe.

3867. For a period of three months you have had all the sheep upon which you depend slaughtered at the port?—Yes.

3868. Have you found that that has injured your trade in Manchester?—Very greatly.

3869. Could you tell the Committee how it affects it?—I can give the Committee the numbers of sheep that have been imported from Hamburg to Manchester during the years when the restrictions were off the cattle traffic. In 1871, when the restrictions were off the cattle traffic, the number of sheep imported from Hamburg to Manchester by Sunderland and West Hartlepool was 30,050.

Colonel *Kingscote.*

3870. Were those alive?—They were alive. That was when there was free transit. In 1872, owing to an order for slaughtering the sheep affected with foot-and-mouth disease, 4,158 were exported from Hamburg to Manchester. In 1873, when the foot-and-mouth disease was not prevalent, 27,518 sheep were imported from Hamburg to Manchester by Sunderland and West Hartlepool alone.

Chairman.

3871. And those came through?—They came through. There was no cattle plague restriction, the foot-and-mouth disease was not prevalent at that time in Germany.

3872. And the sheep were allowed to pass freely?—The sheep were allowed to pass freely after inspection and 12 hours' detention. In 1874 26,042 sheep were imported through Sunderland and West Hartlepool. The numbers brought to the other ports I have not been able to get, on account of so many different agencies being employed.

3873. You do not purchase in London and take through, do you?—Yes, we often sell sheep consigned to the London market and bought by Manchester dealers and brought down. In 1875, when foot-and-mouth disease was prevalent in Germany, 4,210 sheep were exported from Hamburg to Manchester. In 1876, foot-and-mouth disease being then prevalent, 3,960 sheep were imported from Hamburg, against 30,000 in 1871. In 1877, when all foreign stock had to be slaughtered at the port of landing, 2,904 were imported. All these figures refer to the first six months of the year, when the principal foreign supply comes to Manchester.

3874. When you speak of the 2,904 in the last six months, those were dead carcases?—Those were consignments direct from Hamburg to Manchester, but they were obliged to be slaughtered at the port of landing.

3875. And that represents the difference of supply to Manchester of sheep from abroad, as between the free circulation of sheep and the slaughter at the port?—Yes.

3876. Last year they were not under restrictions, were they?—Except that foot-and-mouth disease was present, and if one sheep in a cargo was diseased the whole had to be slaughtered.

3877. But a great number, even in that year, might have circulated through the country?—Three thousand nine hundred and sixty were all that were consigned to Manchester.

3878. But what do you represent caused the difference between the 30,000, which you have described in one year, and that 3,000 in another year?—Foot-and-mouth disease was prevalent, and the dread of having to have them slaughtered at the port of landing lessened the number.

3879. The dread of having to slaughter the whole of the cargo in case one sheep showed a sign of disease stopped the traffic?—Yes.

3880. During the last two years, at least, the trade has been almost practically destroyed?—Yes.

3881. How have you met the supply of Manchester during that time?—During that time the principal supply came from London to Manchester as dead meat; that is to say, they bought the beasts alive in the Islington Market, and sent them down to Manchester.

3882. You have been able to supply the wants of

Chairman—continued.

of your population, although the free circulation of foreign sheep was prohibited?—We have been able to supply them at a higher rate; the cost of the transit of foreign sheep from London to Manchester is ½ *d.* per pound on the carcase.

3883. Is that in addition to your charge?—That is an additional tax, an addition to the cost.

3884. Addititional to what it would have been had you been able to import that same article alive?—Yes; then there is the dealer's profit, which you may reckon another ½ *d.* per pound; that makes it 1 *d.* per extra.

3885. Has the price of mutton risen in that proportion in Manchester in consequence of those restrictions?—Yes.

3886. I suppose that sheep are your principal import from abroad; you do not depend very much upon cattle?—No, very few foreign cattle come to Manchester; Ireland competes with the foreign cattle.

3887. Therefore, if it were possible to allow the circulation of sheep, as far as Manchester is concerned, the markets would not suffer by any restrictions that were placed upon the cattle?—Not so much so; very little.

3888. I suppose that the dead-meat trade that you have described, coming in as it did at the moment when restriction existed on the import of live cattle, to a certain extent, assisted you to tide over the difficulty?—Yes.

3889. And it reduced the price which would otherwise have gone up higher?—Certainly.

3890. You would represent, then, to the Committee, that whilst from the experience which you have had, and from what you have been told by persons engaged in the trade, you do not think that, so far as the Manchester knowledge of the American meat trade has gone, it would ever become a permanent trade which would take its place in the consumption of that district; you believe that to keep prices at the proper level you are very much dependent upon the free import of sheep, at all events, from foreign parts?—Yes.

3891. Is there any other point which you wish to put before the Committee?—I wish to call the attention of the Committee to the fact that I appear here as a witness with the authority of the Salford Markets Committee as representing the council on their behalf.

3892. That is one of the largest markets in the north, is it not?—It is the largest market in the north.

3893. As representing the authorities of that market, would you wish to describe to the Committee the reasons why the import of foreign sheep is necessary for that market?—Yes. In 1857 the number of sheep offered for sale in the Salford Cattle Market was 305,044; and in 1876 the number of sheep offered for sale was 673,971; that is to say, in 19 years the number more than doubled itself.

3894. That shows that you depend every year more upon this import of foreign sheep?—Yes. The foreign sheep are suitable for the wants of the Lancashire operatives; they have small joints, and full of lean flesh, and the people of Lancashire are now getting so much wages that they will only eat the joints. A man wants a joint of some sort; he does not want any rough meat.

3895. You mean that, in consequence of the improvement of the condition of the general population, you are more dependent than you were upon the small lean sheep that you get from abroad?—Yes. Where one man ate meat 20 years ago, I think 10 eat it now in Lancashire.

3896. I understood you to say, that during the last year and a-half, in which you have not been able to get a sufficient amount of import of this kind, you have depended entirely upon the home supply in the London market?—Very much upon the foreign and home supply in the London market.

3897. Although on account of the carriage and other charges the prices have been raised, have you found any falling off in the consumption of meat from people not liking the home animal?—No, they have been getting so much wages that they can afford to buy it. Now they cannot, and it will fall off. The people are getting poorer, and they will not eat so much meat as they have done.

3898. What you would represent, is that they will not buy the English animal, which does not suit them so well as the foreign animal?—There is not a sufficient supply of the English animals to feed them.

3899. But I understand you that during the last 18 months there has been a supply, and that that was a time when this falling off of wages had not taken place?—During the last 18 months wages have fallen off considerably in Lancashire.

3900. Has there been any diminution of consumption during that time?—Yes.

3901. Can you give the amount of consumption in Manchester during the last year or 18 months, as compared with the previous 18 months, when the import of 30,000 sheep took place?—I can give you for the first six months of this year the number of sheep offered for sale in the Salford Cattle Market. The number was 280,368; and in 1871, when the free import of sheep was allowed, it was 356,487. I am speaking now of the time when foreign sheep were imported, in the first six months of the year.

3902. I understand you to be dealing with the first six months of the year in each case, because that is the time when the trade is largest?—Yes; that is the time when most of the sheep come in from abroad those are English and foreign sheep.

3903. You have given us the amounts during the six months of 1877, and the six months in 1871; in 1871 you had free import, and in 1877 you had these restrictions?—Yes. Then I can give you the number of foreign sheep shown in the Salford Market in those years. During the same period in 1871, there were 30,050 foreign sheep; in 1876 there were 3,960; and in 1877, 2,904 altogether were consigned to Manchester; but the latter were compelled to be slaughtered.

3904. You represent that, in 1871, the wages had not risen so as to enable the people to indulge as much in meat as they did subsequently in 1872 and 1873?—I think that the wages were getting very high about 1871.

3905. And you think that in 1876-77, the consumption of meat by those classes has fallen off?—Yes; the consumption has fallen off in 1876-77.

3906. I presume that that is attributable in some degree to the greater cost of the article, and probably also to the fact that they did not get the article that they wished?—Yes, and to the bad state of trade.

3907. Is there any other point that you wish to

Mr. *Lambert*.

13 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

to lay before the Committee?—I should like to speak with regard to the present restrictions on the movements of cattle in this country.

3908. I suppose your great object is to get as large a supply as you possibly can to deal with?—Yes.

3909. You are aware that the two diseases, pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease, have been very rife lately in the country, and that restrictions have been enforced in many parts of the country in consequence?—Yes, but I wish to speak particularly about the cattle plague.

3910. Before going to that, do you think the general restrictions for the purpose of stamping out pleuro-pneumonia and food-and-mouth disease would, if they succeeded, benefit the trade?—As regards pleuro-pneumonia, I think you can stamp it out, but I do not think you can stamp out foot-and-mouth disease.

3911. Do you think that any great inconvenience to the trade or hardship on the people, looking at the result aimed at, that is to say, the stamping out of the disease would be caused by placing very stringent regulations for that purpose upon the movement of cattle?—You could not be too strict in my opinion for pleuro-pneumonia.

3912. And those strict regulations, having for their object the stamping out of the disease, would, if they succeeded, be a benefit to the country generally, by increasing the amount of the home supply?—Yes.

3913. With regard to cattle plague, and the restrictions that are in force on that point, what would you represent to the Committee?—I speak as representing the general opinion of people engaged in the cattle trade; everyone is harassed at present by the restrictions of different local authorities, what is the law in one place is not the law in another.

3914. Then do you represent to the Committee that you think that it would be advantageous to do away with the jurisdiction of the local authorities in questions of cattle plague, and to place it all in the hands of the central authority?—Yes.

3915. And that the inspectors should be subject to the authority of the Privy Council?—Yes.

3916. So that uniformity of regulations might prevail generally?—That is my opinion exactly.

3917. Have you at all considered the question of the regulations that should be enforced with regard to the foreign import?—I think that the regulation which is at present in force of 12 hours' quarantine is sufficient; but I think that the governments of the different countries ought to agree amongst themselves to give one another notice of the breaking out of any infectious or contagious disease. The limitation, suppression, and final extinction of contagious animal diseases, should be regarded by every government as a great work to be accomplished in the general interests of civilisation and humanity.

3918. You think that the present international regulations, as they are called, with regard to telegraphing, should be extended?—Yes, and made binding by a treaty of some kind.

3919. You think that it ought to be made as absolutely certain as it could be that telegraphic warning from the spot where the disease first broke out should be at once communicated to other countries?—Yes.

3920. And you think that that being the case, and proper precautions being taken in foreign countries, you might relax the existing restrictions against cattle plague?—Yes.

3921. You think that 12 hours' quarantine for that purpose would be sufficient?—Yes; provided that they send honest information.

3922. I understood you before to say that you think it would be a great advantage to the trade, and that that object being in view, it would create no material inconvenience if strict regulations were established in this country for the purpose of stamping out pleuro-pneumonia?—Yes.

3923. If we did that, do you think that we should be justified in having sufficiently strict regulations to prevent the import of pleuro-pneumonia from abroad?—Yes.

3924. Pleuro-pneumonia is a disease of which it is very difficult to fix the period of incubation, is it not?—Yes.

3925. And therefore, although the 12 hours' quarantine and the restrictions which you say would be sufficient against the importation of cattle plague, would guard us in that case, do you think that they would guard us against the introduction of pleuro-pneumonia?—They might if you were warned by telegram of its existence in a country.

3926. When you were warned by telegram of its existence in a country, you think that the regulations ought to prohibit the whole import from that country until the disease was stamped out there?—Yes, if pleuro-pneumonia was very rife there. And the government of that country would not take precautions against movements of infected cattle.

3927. Dealing with the Netherlands, where there is a very large amount of pleuro-pneumonia, you think that we should be justified in restricting the import from that country until they could give us a clean bill of health?—I think so.

3928. Supposing, always, that the restrictions were adopted in this country also for the purpose of stamping it out?—Yes. With regard to pleuro-pneumonia, I have had great experience among cattle affected with that disease, and I think that our own regulations at present are not sufficiently stringent as regards reporting.

3929. Would you compensate differently?—If you do not compensate the people will not report.

3930. Do you think that the compensation for declared cases of pleuro-pneumonia should be larger than it is at present?—I think it is quite large enough; but I say that the penalty for not reporting is not sufficient.

3931. You would arrive at the end by inflicting more severe penalties?—I would.

3932. In fact, I suppose you would tell the Committee that you think that any restrictions really having for their object the permanent stamping out of the disease ought to be adopted?—Yes. Pleuro-pneumonia is principally kept up in town dairies; and I think that no fresh cattle ought to be allowed to mix with infected cattle. If a dairyman has a case of pleuro-pneumonia, as the law is now, he can bring 10 fresh cattle among his stock, and add fresh fuel to the fire.

3933. Have you many dairies in Manchester?—I keep 40 milch cows myself.

3934. And you are prepared to recommend that certain restrictions should be established with regard to dairy stock?—I am.

3935. I suppose you would put them all under inspection?

Chairman—continued.

inspection?—I would have inspection of town dairies.

3936. Supposing that the disease showed itself, would you stop all additions to that stock until it was declared to be disinfected?—I would not stop all additions to it; I would allow owners to renew their stock, but they would not allow them to mix fresh stock with the infected stock as they do now.

3937. I suppose that your dairies are carried on in the same way as they are here?—There are no dairies in Manchester in the town.

3938. But you look upon the dairies in towns as the hotbed of disease as has been described?—Yes, as the hotbed of pleuro-pneumonia.

3939. And you think that they ought not to be allowed to continue there except under the strongest possible restrictions?—Yes.

3940. Those restrictions must necessarily prevent the taking in of fresh stock as soon as the outbreak took place?—Yes; fresh stock to be mixed with infected.

3941. As soon as the outbreak took place, you would of course not allow any animal to leave that place?—Only for immediate slaughter.

3942. Subject them always to constant inspection by the proper authorities so as to see that they were properly conducting their business?—Yes.

3943. I understand you to say that you had had considerable experience in pleuro pneumonia yourself?—Yes.

3944. And you think that dairies should be subjected to stronger restrictions than other places, from the fact of their being liable to spread the disease?—Yes; town dairies.

3945. Have you any knowledge of the importation of cows from Holland for dairy purposes?—We do not import any into Lancashire from Holland. Another subject about which I should like to speak is inoculation for pleuro-pneumonia. I think that that ought to be compulsory when pleuro-pneumonia breaks out in a dairy stock.

3946. You are aware that there are very different opinions as to the effect of inoculation, and that it has been tried in some countries, and that pleuro-pneumonia remains still a very highly developed disease in those countries?—Yes.

3947. Have you tried inoculation?—I have not tried it, but on the next outbreak I have, I am so convinced of the efficacy of it, that I shall inoculate all my cattle. You get rid of the disease in a short time, and you are able to bring fresh stock upon your premises. You may kill 10 per cent., but pleuro-pneumonia, as a rule, takes 60 per cent.

3948. You have not practical experience of inoculation?—No, I have not, it is from reading.

3949. And you have such faith in it that you propose to try it yourself?—Yes.

3950. Would you say that it ought to be a part of the law until you have made the experiment, and ascertained whether your theory is correct?—I am so convinced from hearing people describe it who have tried it, that I believe it would be a very good law. You can never tell when you are rid of pleuro-pneumonia. If it once gets into your stock it may lurk about your place for two years.

3951. I understand you say that, whilst you are in favour of doing away, as far as possible, with

Chairman—continued.

restrictions against the foreign trade, you think that those restrictions should be still continued in the case of pleuro-pneumonia, and that they should be adopted also in this country, with a view of stamping out a disease which has diminished very largely the home supply, and probably also the foreign supply, of the country?—I think so.

3952. I understand you to say that you think it is possible to stamp it out?—I do not think it would be possible except extending over a number of years.

3953. You agree with Professor Browne that it would take some years to eradicate it, but you think that the restrictions which would have to be borne for years would be well worth enduring for the end to be attained?—Yes.

3954. Do you wish to say anything with regard to foot-and-mouth disease?—With reference to foot-and-mouth disease, I think that the law at present is harassing and vexatious in every way.

3955. Do you attach as much importance to foot-and-mouth disease as you seem to attach to pleuro-pneumonia?—Not the least. I do not anything of foot-and-mouth disease. I think that continual centres of infection has been engendered and kept up by the present law.

3956. In what way?—I will give you an instance. You have a farm, and foot-and-mouth disease breaks out upon it; you are not allowed to remove your cattle for slaughter; first one takes the disease and then another, and a continued centre of infection is kept up.

3957. Do you not believe that it is possible to disinfect the place?—I believe that it is utterly impossible to stamp out foot-and-mouth disease except with cattle plague rules, and it is not worth the while of the country to do such a thing.

3958. You say that you have had experience of pleuro-pneumonia, and that you have yourself animals of your own?—Yes.

3959. Have you suffered from foot-and-mouth disease?—Yes.

3960. When you have had the foot-and-mouth disease in your herds have you not found that it caused a great deterioration of your stock?—Excepting in milch cows the deterioration is very little indeed; in the case of milch cows it is great.

3961. Is that not only from the destruction of the milk for the time, and also from the fear of their subsequent calving?—It injures the milk, glands, and the teats.

3962. Have you had many cows drop their calves after they have had the disease?—In some years; I think about the year 1873 we had a great many; but latterly the outbreaks have not been so bad.

3963. All that, when it does come, of course is a great practical loss as well as detrimental to the cows themselves?—Yes.

3964. Do you think that with regard to your fatting stock, that the foot-and-mouth disease is not very much to be dreaded?—Not so much.

3965. Of course it depreciates your stock for a time, and stops your profit for a certain period?—Yes.

3966. You have to feed twice?—No, not twice; I think perhaps that 1 *l.* in the extreme cases would cover the loss.

3967. You do not think that it throws the con-

Mr *Lambert.*

13 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

dition of the animals so far back that the first condition is practically lost?—No.

3968. Still, to that extent it is a loss on each animal?—Yes.

3969. In addition to the loss to the supply of the country, you have the fact that you have to keep that stock on your farm as one supply instead of putting on another supply afterwards?—Yes.

3970. So that the foot-and-mouth disease diminishes the supply?—Yes, to a certain extent, but very little.

3971. But you think, notwithstanding that and notwithstanding the deterioration of stock, it is not a disease the severity of which you dread, or which you think it is worth enduring any restrictions for?—My opinion, and the opinion of all practical men in the cattle trade that I have ever talked to, is that it ought to be taken out of the Act altogether.

3972. You would have foot-and mouth disease perfectly unrestricted?—Except with regard to travelling on the high road, or being shown at store fairs; I would not allow them to be exposed in a store cattle fair.

3973. That allows a very large remainder, as I may call it, of restrictions against foot-and-mouth disease. You would approve of the restrictions forbidding movements either to markets or along the roads in cases of foot-and-mouth disease?—Yes, store cattle markets.

3974. What other restrictions are there which you would relax as regards foot-and-mouth disease?—The restrictions at present are not of the least good. In some store cattle markets they take one cow out of a lot and let the others go over the country.

3975. Then instead of relaxing the restrictions in regard to foot-and-mouth disease, you would establish more stringent ones?—I would not allow anyone to expose for sale in an open store market, any cattle suffering from foot-and-mouth disease under a severe penalty, but I do not apply this remark to fat cattle markets.

3976. You would adopt, with regard to foot-and-mouth disease, when declared, the same restrictions as with regard to pleuro-pneumonia, only that you would not compel the slaughtering of cattle?—At present the regulations with regard to foot-and-mouth disease are regulations and restrictions on the circulation of cattle; those you propose to continue?—At present if you own two fields, one on each side of the road, you are obliged to keep your cows in those fields, and you cannot bring those cows across the road to your house.

3977. You would allow a person to move them on his farm as he pleased, so long as he did not take them along a public road or send them to market?—Yes.

3978. But still you do not think that would be entirely safe to withdraw all restrictions as to foot-and-mouth disease, and to allow animals to circulate as people pleased?—It is the opinion of every practical man that foot-and-mouth disease will never be stamped out in this country; but I think those regulations would check it in a great measure.

3979. My attention has been called to the fact that in case of foot-and-mouth disease, it is contrary to the law at present to expose animals in markets and to move them on roads?—It is.

3980. As I understand you, you would not

Chairman—continued.

withdraw those restrictions?—That is the law at present.

3981. You would not relax that law at present with regard to foot-and-mouth disease, but you would strengthen the law with regard to pleuro-pneumonia?—Yes; I mean to say that no restrictions that you can put on, except total stoppage of cattle traffic, will stamp out foot-and-mouth disease, and it is not worth the country's while to do it; the inconvenience would be greater than the loss.

3982. Then you would leave the restrictions just as they are?—In store cattle markets you can show a lot of beasts and take one out and let the whole lot go away, and that is no restriction at all.

3983. What you want is, in fact, that there should be uniformity of restrictions throughout the country, limiting those restrictions as much as possible in case of foot-and-mouth disease, for which you do not think strong restrictions are necessary or advisable?—Yes.

3984. But, when you come to deal with the other two diseases, you are quite prepared to say that very stringent regulations and restrictions ought to be imposed?—Certainly.

3985. Is there any other point upon which you wish to speak to the Committee?—I think not.

Major *Allen.*

3986. I understood you to say that the import of sheep took place principally in the first six months of the year?—Yes.

3987. How is the market supplied during the other six months in the year?—From Ireland chiefly.

3988. Do you get enough from Ireland during those six months?—Yes, from Ireland and from the north of England.

3989. Supposing that we could stamp out pleuro-pneumonia, do you think that we could grow meat enough in this country for the wants of the people?—Most certainly not.

3990. So that what you wish is to perfect free trade, more especially in sheep?—Yes.

3991. You say that you have no dairies in Manchester?—No.

3992. Do you keep all your cows in sheds, or are they roaming about?—They are kept in sheds, and are turned out on the grass in the summer. Manchester is principally supplied with milk from Cheshire by train.

Mr. *Arthur Peel.*

3993. You said, did you not, that the great majority of your American dead-meat depôts were shut up in Manchester?—They are.

3994. Can you speak at all with reference to Liverpool?—I cannot speak with reference to Liverpool.

3995. You do not know whether it is true that any of the stores there have been shut up?—I have heard Liverpool men say so in the markets; I attend Liverpool market every Monday.

3996. And you think, broadly speaking, that meat deteriorates when it is in contact with ice or when it is subject to the action of ice?—My experience is, that the American meat deteriorates in two days when it is exposed to the atmosphere.

3997. What is the length of transit of animals from

Mr. *Arthur Peel*—continued.

from Sunderland and Hartlepool to Manchester?—I should think from about 14 to 16 hours.

3998. How is the meat treated in hot weather?—It often comes very bad in hot weather.

3999. Is there any ice in the vans?—No.

4000. Can you speak as to the quality of the American cattle which the dead-meat trade represents; is it as good as the quality of the meat which is imported alive?—Yes; some of it is very good indeed, and could not be better.

4001. We have had it in evidence that the pick of the American meat is sent to us as dead meat, but that some of the live stock that is sent to us is of inferior quality; do you agree with that?—No. I saw 285 American bullocks in Liverpool on Monday, and they were all in perfectly good condition; there was not a scratch or a bruise of any kind upon them.

4002. Where did they come from?—I do not know exactly. They were under three different people, all Americans. I am certain that the American live trade would work, but the American dead-meat trade never would work. They can bring them alive in good condition.

4003. Can you give us any facts as to the number of live cattle now coming from America?—I have not any facts, but, according to the Manchester papers of last week, about 1,500 American cattle arrived alive in seven days.

4004. Were they of the best quality?—Of the best quality; 200 of them were sold in Liverpool at 32 *l.* each.

4005. What would that represent per pound?—About $8\frac{1}{2}$ *d.*

4006. What was the American dead meat selling at at the same time?—About $5\frac{1}{2}$ *d.* or $5\frac{3}{4}$ *d.* per pound.

4007. What was the price of home-killed meat at that time at Manchester?—It was, beef $8\frac{1}{2}$ *d.*, mutton $9\frac{1}{2}$ *d.* per pound for the carcase of English meat last week in Manchester.

4008. You said that you thought that the foot-and-mouth disease was kept up by the present law; did you make that statement simply with reference to the difficulty of moving cattle affected by foot-and-mouth disease on your own farm when the disease broke out?—Yes.

4009. In short, it is only in that way that you would like to see any relaxation of the restriction?—At present we cannot remove them even to a slaughter-house along the road in a float. If you have this disease, they must all go through it, and perhaps ruin you. I would allow them to be moved in a float or low cart to a slaughter-house.

4010. Along a public road?—Yes.

4011. You think that there would be no danger in it?—Not the least.

Colonel *Kingscote*.

4012. I think you say that this dead-meat trade could never answer?—Not in the hot weather.

4013. Are you not aware that Mr. Lyon, who is a large butcher in the metropolis, said in his evidence before this Committee that in the very hottest weather of last August he saw American meat that had come over in the best state he had seen it in at all?—It might come over and arrive all right, but in two days it would be putrid.

4014. Evidence has been given quite to the contrary; but you still say, although you have never tasted the American meat, that it is your

Colonel *Kingscote*—continued.

opinion that the trade cannot possibly answer?—I give it as my own opinion, and I go by the fact that the principal stores are closing.

4015. Were those stores started by butchers, or by people who, seeing a new trade springing up, thought they would dabble in it, knowing nothing about it?—They called themselves the "American Meat Company"; I do not know who they were.

4016. They were not butchers?—Yes; they were assisted by journeymen butchers of the town.

4017. Is it not a fact that the butchers now buy this American meat and sell it largely?—Not in Manchester.

4018. Do you feel confident of that?—I am certain of it.

4019. Are you aware that it is done in London?—It may be so in London.

4020. And also in Liverpool?—Very few do it in Liverpool. I know nearly all the butchers in Liverpool, and I do not know a single Liverpool butcher who sells the American meat at all.

4021. You cannot deny the fact that so many tons of this meat come over every week?—So many tons come over, and so many tons are destroyed. I see in a paper that I have before me, that American meat has been selling at 3 *d.* per lb. in London.

4022. Do you believe that the whole of this meat comes to London direct?—It comes through Liverpool, I believe, most of it.

4023. And none of it is sold in Liverpool or in Manchester?—A lot of it goes to Leeds and Sheffield, and different markets; it does not all come to London.

4024. But still at Liverpool and Manchester you say that none has been sold?—Yes; a great quantity has been sold every week.

4025. Then who sells it, because you say that these companies are broken up, and that the butchers do not sell it?—Anyone can sell it; I do not know a single Manchester butcher who sells the American dead meat.

4026. Is any sold in Manchester?—Yes; there is some sold, but very little. The last two months it has begun to fall off rapidly.

4027. I think you said just now that the people in Manchester are not buying nearly the quantity of meat that they did, because they were poorer?—I cannot say why it is; I said that there was not the quantity. It is the difference in price; the price is higher, and they cannot afford to buy it.

4028. I thought you said they were buying less meat in Manchester now than they were?—There is less meat comes into Manchester altogether, and there must be less sold.

4029. That might account for there not being such a demand for American meat, might it not?—I should think that there is more demand for American when there is less of other meat.

4030. Did I correctly understand you to say that the consumers preferred the foreign sheep to any English sheep?—No; I said that the Lancashire operatives, the lower class of people, like the foreign sheep because they are more suitable for their wants.

4031. Because they like the smaller joints?—They like the smaller joints; they are full of lean flesh.

4032. Do you think that the Lancashire operatives dislike the American dead meat?—It is a

Mr. *Lambert.*

13 June 1877.

Colonel *Kingscote*—continued.

proof that they do not like it, when the trade has fallen off.

4033. You have never embarked in the trade yourself?—No.

4034. And you do not intend to do so?—I should do so quickly enough if I thought there was any money to be got out of it.

4035. You have given rather a decided opinion about inoculation for pleuro-pneumonia, and also about the diseases of animals; have you ever been bred up to any veterinary learning?—I am a member of the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons, but I do not practice. I was educated at Alfort, near Paris, under Professor Bouley.

4036. With regard to foot-and-mouth disease, did I correctly understand you to say, that you think so lightly of it that you would do away with all exceptions, excepting those as to moving animals along roads and exposing them in fairs and markets?—Yes, store stock fairs.

4037. Do you not consider that foot-and-mouth disease entails a very great loss upon this country throughout the year?—It brings a loss.

4038. And a very heavy loss?—Yes.

4039. Do you not think that it would be very much in the interest, not only of the producers of cattle, but of the consumers of meat, if foot-and-mouth disease could be put an end to in this country?—You cannot put an end to it, in my opinion; I think that it is indigenous to this country, and that with the movement of cattle it will always break out. It always breaks out in the hot wet weather at the fall of the year. There is generally more foot-and-mouth disease then than at any other time.

4040. You think that it breaks out spontaneously?—Yes.

Mr. *John Holms.*

4041. I think you said that you have seen some live American cattle at Liverpool?—Yes.

4042. And you said that they looked very well?—Yes, very well indeed.

4043. Did they look as well as English beasts?—Quite as well, and in much better condition than some Irish cattle.

4044. Were they in better condition than Continental cattle?—Much better.

4045. If these American cattle come alive and are of so high a quality, and if they could be killed on the other side and carefully preserved and brought over here, the meat would be as good meat as the English meat?—I say that American beef is quite as good as English beef; I do not say anything against American beef.

4046. The whole question, then, is a matter of science and experience as to how to kill it, preserve it, and bring it over?—Yes.

4047. Have you tasted the very best American beef?—I have never tasted any at all.

4048. And yet you say, I think, that it is not good?—I give it as my opinion from hearing people speak of it who have tasted it.

4049. Do you know whether there is any loss of weight in live cattle coming a long distance; that is to say, if cattle were put on board a vessel abroad, and brought here and killed at the time they ordinarily do kill them, is there any real loss of weight?—It depends upon how the cattle stand the voyage. If they eat and drink and do well and are not sick, they do not lose weight,

Mr. *John Holms*—continued.

but if they cannot eat and drink they must lose flesh.

4050. But from you own experience, is there a loss?—I should say that there is a loss in weight, decidedly.

4051. To what extent?—I do not see how you could get at it to prove it. There must be a loss. A man travelling loses weight himself if he is off his food.

4052. But you could not on that subject give any specific figures to guide the Committee?—No, I could not.

4053. Would you consider that the loss by carriage by sea would be greater or less than the loss by carriage by rail; that is to say, would live cattle coming, say from Aberdeen to London by rail, lose more or less than cattle coming, say from Hamburg to London by sea?—I should say they would lose less; the journey is shorter and quicker

4054. But they would lose something?—Yes; they would lose a little.

4055. You could not fix any amount in that case either?—No.

4056. What is the ordinary way of buying and selling live cattle in this country; is there any fixed mode of arriving at what you consider to be the value?—No; there is no fixed mode. A man has to buy by his intelligence. His intelligence tells him what to give. There is no measuring, or weighing, or anything like that in this country.

4057. Are you aware that in America they fix it by the live weight?—Yes.

4058. But you do not do so here?—No.

Mr. *Norwood.*

4059. Have you had any business in cattle alive or dead from the Continent?—Yes.

4060. Would it be desirable, in your opinion, to stop the importation of live cattle?—I think not.

4061. You think that would be a very great disadvantage to the country?—Yes; I think so.

4062. These cattle are useful, and come over in fair condition?—Yes.

Mr. *French.*

4063. You say that you are in favour of imposing heavy penalties upon persons exposing for sale in the market cattle that are suffering from foot-and-mouth disease; what would you propose to do with cattle amongst which foot-and-mouth disease broke out when they were in transit?—I should allow them to take them to some farm until they recovered.

4064. Do you keep any sheep at all?—Yes.

4065. Have you ever suffered from foot-and-mouth disease amongst your sheep?—Yes.

4066. Did you find the loss which you suffered from the effects of foot-and-mouth disease amongst the sheep greater or less than amongst the horned cattle?—The loss amongst sheep is very slight compared with the loss amongst horned cattle. It is nothing at all amongst sheep.

4067. Have you had it amongst breeding sheep?—Yes; amongst breeding ewes. The loss would be greater there.

4068. Do you think that it would be possible to stamp out foot-and-mouth disease by restricting the movement of cattle?—It would; but it is not worth while. The remedy would be a great deal

worse

Mr. *French*—continued.

worse than the disease, and the disease being indigenous would break out again.

4069. Do you not think that foot-and-mouth disease is carried from farm to farm by other means than by cattle?—I am certain that it is carried by hares. I have had it brought by hares myself on my own farm.

Mr. *King-Harman.*

4070. You say that at one period the American dead meat was selling in the Manchester market at from 5 *d.* to 5 ½ *d.* per lb. at the same time that the live cattle from America were selling at about 8 *d.* per lb.?—That was last week.

4071. What difference would the offal make on that?—They do not give the offal with the carcase.

4072. But the American beast was sold as he stood?—The offal would make from 1 *d.* to ¾ *d.* per lb.

4073. Then the dead American meat was bought by the salesmen?—Yes.

4074. And the live animal was bought by the retailers, I suppose?—Yes.

4075. Would not that account to a very considerable extent for the difference between the 5 *d.* and the 8 *d.*?—No; the butchers buy the live animal, and they buy the dead carcase in the same way.

4076. But there is another profit to be taken out, is there not?—No; the American dead meat comes direct from the agent to the retailer.

4077. What would you say that the live animal loses a day in travelling after leaving home?—I could not tell; it would be hard work to tell that.

4078. Would it lose a butcher's stone, 8 lbs.?—I should think it would lose more.

4079. Would it lose 14 lbs.?—I cannot tell; I do not see how you can get practically at it.

4080. But giving an approximate idea, would you say that it would lose over 8 lbs.?—Yes, I should certainly say that it would lose over 8 lbs.; from the urine and the fœcal matter from a beast you lose over that weight.

Mr. *M'Lagan.*

4081. I suppose that cattle will lose weight in travelling according to the quantity of food or water that they take, and if they are well provided with these on the journey they will lose less?—Yes.

4082. Is your trade principally that of selling live cattle?—Yes.

4083. Are they generally consigned to you, or do you purchase the stock?—They are all consigned to us.

4084. And therefore any law that would prohibit the importation of live stock would interfere very much with your trade, would it not?—No, it would not interfere with our trade. When we sell dead stock we get double commission; we charge double for selling the carcases that we do for selling the live stock; when we have any stopped at the East ports we always slaughter them and sell them, and we get double commission.

4085. And therefore it is a matter of indifference to you whether you sell live stock or dead?—It is no matter at all to me.

4086. You stated the number of sheep that were sold at Salford during the first six months of 1871, and during the corresponding six months of 1877; do you know what was the price of meat

Mr. *M'Lagan*—continued.

in the first six months of 1871?—I could not state that; but meat is at present dearer than it ever has been in my recollection.

4087. Even though the consumption is not so great?—Even though the consumption is not so great; the supply is not so great.

4088. But I thought you said also that the consumption is not so great?—It cannot be so great, because there is not a sufficient supply, and if people have not it they cannot eat it.

4089. As I understood you, the consumers in Manchester prefer the foreign sheep because they like a small joint better than a large joint?—Yes.

4090. Did I correctly understand you to say that the meat was more juicy?—As a rule there is more lean and less fat; it is more suitable for their wants.

4091. And it is during the winter months when they get that mutton?—It is from January to June.

4092. During the second six months of the year they get sheep from Ireland and from the North of England?—Yes.

4093. Is it because they are compelled to eat the sheep from Ireland and the North of England that they eat them, or would they not prefer the foreign sheep then if they could get them?—It is because Ireland can compete with any country. The Irish sheep can drive out the foreign sheep because they can afford to sell them in the grass season at a less price.

4094. The kind of sheep that you get from Ireland and from the North of England are quite different from those which you get from abroad, are they not?—Not quite different. A great many small mountain-sheep come from Ireland. Those from the North of England are mostly lean sheep. They are sheep full of lean mutton; the proportion of lean is greater than of fat.

4095. They are not the Leicester stock?—No. Some of them are a cross of the Leicester, but they are principally lean sheep.

4096. So far as your experience has gone, I understand you to say you do not think that the importation of dead meat from America will succeed?—Decidedly not; that is my opinion.

4097. How long will meat killed in this country keep in winter?—I have kept a leg of mutton six weeks myself.

4098. In the slaughter-houses in Manchester, are any provisions made for keeping the temperature low?—The public slaughter-houses in Manchester are models; they are recently built, and are made on the most improved principle.

4099. Are you aware that in the slaughter-houses in America, where the dead meat is produced that is sent to this country, the temperature is very much reduced, so as to preserve the meat as much as possible?—Yes.

4100. Have you adopted in Manchester the means that are adopted in America for keeping down the temperature?—No, it is not worth the while there; the meat gets sold more quickly.

4101. The meat, however, that is killed in a slaughter-house where the temperature is very much reduced by artificial means, is more likely to keep long than when those means are not adopted, is it not?—Yes.

4102. Therefore, would you not say that the American dead meat has a better chance of keeping longer than any meat which is killed in this country, so far as you know, even in the best slaughter-houses?—No, it has not. American

Mr. *Lambert.*

13 June 1877.

Mr. *M'Lagan*—continued.

dead meat decomposes more quickly than English meat.

4103. But if it is killed in a cooler slaughter-house it is more likely to keep longer than any that is killed in this country, is it not?—If it was kept in that temperature it would keep.

4104. It is carried directly from this slaughter-house, not to a freezing temperature, but to a cold temperature, is it not?—Yes.

4105. Do you see any difference between the temperature on board a ship and the temperature in an ordinary butcher's shop?—I believe, from what I have read, that the temperature that this beef comes in is from 34 degrees to 36 degrees.

4106. And in a butcher's shop, in Manchester, it is much higher, is it not?—In a slaughter-house it is generally about 40 degrees; they contrive to place them out of the sun.

4107. And therefore the American beef, so far as we have gone, has that advantage over the home-killed meat; but when you bring it into a butcher's shop the temperature is much higher there, is it not?—Yes.

4108. And still the American beef is kept in a temperature of 34 degrees on board ship?—I believe so.

4109. Therefore everything seems to be in favour of the American beef as regards temperature, and the care that is taken of it until it comes to this country?—Yes.

4110. Do you see any reason why, when you bring it to this country, it should keep so much shorter a time than the meat which is killed in this country?—I could not explain to you the reason, but I know as a fact that it does not keep so long. It easily becomes like smothered beef, of a brick-red colour.

4111. Perhaps that is owing to the operation not being properly performed. How long has this trade been in existence?—I think about a year.

4112. Have you ever seen any trade so rapidly developed in the same time as this American dead-meat trade has done?—The stoppage of the importation of German stock has been in favour of it.

4113. But it has been very rapidly developed, has it not?—On account of the stoppage of the German stock, which has raised prices in this country; that has been in favour of the American meat trade.

4114. You say that you are a veterinary surgeon, and you have, of course studied chemistry and other sciences; could you, from your knowledge of science, have foretold about two years ago that we should get into this country thousands of tons of beef every week from America in very good condition?—Yes; I believe it was foretold about five years ago by Professor Gamgee that this could be done.

4115. By means of freezing?—Yes.

4116. And you are, therefore, not at all surprised that we get the quantity that we do get?—No.

4117. Then you would not be surprised if, in another year after this, the means of importing American beef should be so much improved that we should get it in much better condition than we get it in now?—No.

4118. You think that we should be quite justified in supposing that we should be likely to get American beef in a year or two's time in as

Mr. *M'Lagan*—continued.

good order as we have any English beef?—Yes, in the cold weather.

4119. But it makes no difference, if it is kept always in the same temperature, whether the weather is cold or hot, does it?—They are obliged to expose it to people to sell it.

4120. But you have the same inconvenience with regard to your home-killed beef?—Yes; but they can kill home-killed beef just to suit their convenience. A man can kill one beast or two, just as he has to sell it; but if he gets 20 carcases of beef he must sell it, or it goes bad.

4121. Do you think that if this trade is developed the salesmen, or the importers of this beef, will not adopt means for keeping the beef in this country and selling it as it is wanted?—They will try to do so.

4122. If they can keep the American beef on board ship at a temperature of 34 degrees, do you think that they will not construct cellars or buildings in which they can keep the beef at the same temperature here, and take it out as it is wanted?—It will be regulated by the price, of course.

4123. And therefore there is nothing impossible in that?—There is nothing impossible in it.

4124. If the trade is once fairly established we may look, may we not, to that being done, and to the meat being distributed to the people as it is wanted, in good condition?—Yes, if it pays them to send it.

4125. You do something with store-cattle, do you not?—Yes.

4126. And, notwithstanding that, you are strongly in favour of the restrictions which exist at the present time with regard to foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia?—Yes.

4127. I think you misunderstood a question which was put to you by the honourable Member opposite; I think you said that you cannot stamp out foot-and-mouth disease?—I say that you can stamp it out, but that the remedy would be worse than the disease.

4128. I thought you said that it was indigenous?—You could stamp it out by keeping cattle from travelling, but it would break out again.

4129. And therefore you could not stamp it out as you could the cattle plague?—No; in my opinion it is indigenous to the country.

4130. Do you sell more English cattle and sheep than you do foreign cattle and sheep?—Yes, the foreign stock that we sell are only about one-eight of the whole.

4131. Therefore it would be your interest to have as much home stock as possible?—Yes.

4132. In fact, your business depends very much upon that?—Yes.

Mr. *Jacob Bright.*

4133. You seem to have taken great interest in this question of American dead meat?—I have.

4134. Do you know when it first began to come to this country?—I think it was about last August.

4135. Then that has not been 12 months?—No.

4136. Do I correctly understand from you that a great deal of it has been condemned throughout the whole period of the import?—Yes, at times; but only in the hot weather.

4137. You are not aware that it has been condemned

Mr. *Jacob Bright*—continued.

condemned in the cold weather?—I believe some has been condemned in London; I have heard so.

4138. This year I suppose we have not had above a fortnight of hot weather?—In Manchester we have only had about three or four hot days.

4139. In that case, if it has only been condemned in the hot weather, very little of it must have been condemned?—Yes.

4140. Should you be surprised if I told you that a friend of mine in London buys nothing else for his house but American beef and gets it for 8½ *d.* a lb., and that he buys it because he considers it so much better that the English beef; and should you be surprised to know that he does that throughout the hot weather we have been having?—I should not be surprised, because he can pick his beef, and pick it fresh.

4141. We have had evidence that the trade began at a much earlier period than you spoke of. You have expressed a strong opinion with regard to the restrictions which should be put upon cattle affected with pleuro-pneumonia; do you want stronger restrictions than those which we have already got?—Yes, we want heavier penalties.

4142. With reference to the import of cattle, do you want any other restriction with regard to pleuro-pneumonia than those which we have already got?—I have said that if the Governments would warn one another of an outbreak the present restrictions would be sufficient.

4143. You are not disposed to ask for more restrictions with regard to that disease?—No.

4144. And in any case would you not think that there ought to be the same restrictions at home with regard to the movement of cattle in reference to that disease?—I believe the restrictions are as stringent at home now as they are with regard to cattle from abroad.

4145. Then you are not as anxious to increase the restriction that are put upon the importation of cattle?—No.

4146. I ask you if you are in favour of further restrictions, and, if so, what those restrictions should be?—As regards the home stock, I am in favour of a heavier penalty being imposed upon anyone not reporting pleuro-pneumonia at once. With regard to the importation of cattle, I said that if each foreign government warned this Government by telegram when an outbreak occurred, I think that the present restrictions would be sufficient.

4147. You do not see any advantage in adding to those restrictions?—No.

Mr. *Assheton.*

4148. I think I understood you to say that the sheep from the Continent, which used to be imported alive to Manchester through Sunderland and West Hartlepool have, for the last three months, been slaughtered at those ports?—Yes.

4149. And I think you say that the result is, that the meat from those sheep is sold at a dearer price in Manchester?—The result is that the quantity of meat has diminished.

4150. Has the meat that has come been sold at a higher or a lower price than it used to be sold at before it was slaughtered at the ports?—The dead meat was sold at a much lower price at one time this spring on account of the very bad state in which it arrived.

Mr. *Assheton*—continued.

4151. Was it sold at Manchester at a lower price in the form of carcases than in the form of live beasts?—Yes.

4152. Do I correctly understand you to think that it is desirable that the supply should come to Manchester in the form of live sheep instead of in the form of carcases?—Yes, very desirable.

4153. Why so?—Because the facts show that when you begin to slaughter you stop the trade altogether; the import drops off from 30,000 to 2,000.

4154. Can you account for that?—It is because it does not pay the exporter to send them. He can send them alive to the Paris market now without the risk of a dead-meat trade.

4155. Then does it cost more to bring a live sheep to Sunderland and kill it, and then to bring the carcase on to Manchester, than it does to bring the live sheep straight through to Manchester?—Yes; it costs about 2 *s.* a head more.

4156. Then do I correctly understand you to say that the carcases are much more expensive to convey than the live sheep?—They are not more expensive, but the expenses at the port are greater. The charge for slaughtering, and the wharfage, and the landing, and the other charges, are very great.

4157. Are the expenses of butchering greater at Sunderland than they would be at Manchester?—Yes; it is a precarious trade, and the butchers sometimes strike, and you have to pay them any price to kill the sheep. If there is a large supply they strike, and will not kill them under a certain price.

4158. Did I correctly understand you to say that if the meat came in the form of carcases, you got double the commission on it that you did if it came in the form of live sheep?—Yes, exactly double.

4159. That would rather enhance the price in Manchester, would it not?—The commission would not amount to one-eighth of a penny per pound.

4160. I did not quite understand the answer which you gave just now, that you managed to keep a temperature of 40 degrees in the Manchester slaughter-houses, and yet that you have no artificial means of cooling; what did you mean by that?—I am talking of the public slaughter-houses, which are built so as to be protected from the south-west. The heat of the sun never gets on them; they are protected and ventilated so that no sun gets near them, and the roofs are whitewashed.

4161. I do not want to catch you in any trap, but I do not understand how, without artificial means and ice, you are able to keep any slaughter-house, however well made, at a temperature of 40 degrees at all times of the year?—I do not say that you can in hot weather, without artificial means.

4162. I understood you wrongly then?—Yes.

Mr. *W. E. Forster.*

4163. Does any dead meat come into the Manchester market except American dead meat?—During the cattle-plague, the German and Dutch beef from the Continent of Europe came there.

4164. At what port was it landed?—Princi-

Mr. Lambert.

13 June 1877.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

pally at Sunderland and West Hartlepool, and some at Grimsby.

4165. In what state does it get to your market?—It has been slaughtered at those ports.

4166. Is there any dead meat that is exported from any foreign country besides America, that is killed before it leaves the country?—No, it never comes to Manchester.

4167. Then your experience of what you may call the dead-meat trade as exported from a foreign country, is confined to the trade from America?—Yes.

4168. In what months do you think that you have had the largest import of this dead meat?—About January, February, March, and April, I think, into Manchester.

4169. Do you think that it had much effect upon the price?—Most certainly it had a great effect.

4170. Do you imagine that the supply of dead meat can be relied upon to replace the supply of live cattle that come from the Continent?—I do not think it can.

4171. What effect do you think the stoppage of the import of live cattle would have upon the Manchester market?—It would cause a rapid rise in the prices.

4172. I think I understood you to say that you thought it would apply more to sheep than to cattle?—Yes, as regards Manchester. Very few German beasts came to Manchester even at the time when there were no restrictions.

4173. Nevertheless, if you got home animals that would otherwise go to the places to which those German cattle go, you would feel it in Manchester just as much?—Yes.

4174. A good deal of the meat that you consume comes from Ireland, I suppose?—The principal supply to Lancashire in the season when they are fed on grass in the summer months, from June to Christmas, is Irish.

4175. As regard foot-and-mouth disease, do you think that you have got much of it from the Irish animals?—Not lately; Ireland has been entirely free these last two months; it was very prevalent about January last.

4176. I understand you to say that you would not recommend any regulation with regard to foot-and-mouth disease, except stopping the sale in a public place or the carriage of animals infected with the disease?—I would not recommend that they should be reported as at present. The police come on to your place and carry it from one place to another.

4177. The Committee of the House of Commons, in 1873, came to this conclusion: "Many witnesses have been examined with regard to this disease, especially as to its recent prevalence, both in Great Britain and Ireland, and their opinions have been conflicting both as regards the amount of loss it causes and the measures which should be adopted for its diminution. Some agriculturists have recommended very stringent measures such as the stoppage of all fairs and markets, and of the movement of animals, except by license as during the prevalence of the cattle plague. On the other hand, there has been evidence of much weight, both by agriculturists and by professional witnesses, tending to show that such enactments would meet with strong opposition and would be difficult, if not impossible, to carry out. Your Committee have come to the conclusion that it is

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

hopeless to attempt to extirpate or even materially to check this disease, unless the above-mentioned stringent measures are strictly enforced." And then they go on to say that they think that the public would not bear the enforcement of those measures; that is your view, is it not?—That is my opinion.

4178. With regard to pleuro-pneumonia, I did not quite understand whether you would wish the import of all live cattle to be prohibited from any country in which pleuro-pneumonia existed?—You would have to prohibit it from almost everywhere, if you did that. I said that when the disease was very rife in a country and the government of that country did not take means to prevent infected herds travelling, I should prohibit the importation of live cattle from that country.

4179. But the fact that pleuro-pneumonia was not exterminated in that country would not make you prohibit the import of live cattle from it?—No.

4180. I suppose you are aware that at the present moment the restrictions, with reference to animals affected by pleuro-pneumonia that are imported from abroad, are more severe than in cases in which it is found in a home-herd in this respect; that if one animal in a cargo is found to have pleuro-pneumonia, all the rest of the animals are ordered to be slaughtered; whereas the most that is ever done with the home-herds is that those that have come in contact with the infected animals are isolated for a certain time?—Yes.

4181. You are also aware that, with regard to foot and mouth disease, the same regulation applies; that if one of the foreign animals has it, all the rest are slaughtered?—Yes.

4182. With that difference between the treatment of foreign animals and home animals, do you recommend any further restrictions with regard to the foreign animals?—No.

Chairman.

4183. I did not understand you to state what the price of meat had ruled at in Manchester during the last six months?—During the last six months the whole carcase of beef of the best quality has been 8½ *d.* per pound, and mutton has been 9½ *d.* per pound.

4184. Can you compare that with the six months which you quoted in 1871, and give us the price which ruled then?—It was much lower. It is very much higher than it has ever before been in my recollection.

4185. Do you attribute that to the stoppage of that supply?—Yes.

4186. That is to say with regard to the price of mutton?—Yes.

4187. With regard to beef, I understood you to say that the foreign import did not much affect Manchester?—It does not.

4188. But the price of mutton has risen in consequence of the stoppage of the free circulation of sheep?—Yes.

4189. Can you tell the Committee whether, in Manchester, the proportion of foreign mutton to home mutton, is larger than the proportion of foreign cattle to home cattle?—In the first six months of the year the foreign import of sheep exposed for sale in the market, when there is no restriction, is about one-third of the total number. Very little foreign beef comes to Manchester at all.

4190. I suppose

Mr. *Lambert.*

13 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

4190. I suppose that the price of the home supply, naturally varies very much according to the feed of the surrounding districts; when you are short of feed in the surrounding districts, the supply is short, and consequently the price of the home supply rises?—Yes.

4191. And that might account for the rise in the price of cattle, as we have had one or two years of very short feed?—Yes.

4192. I understand you to say that you have taken the first six months of the year and compared them, because then the import principally takes place?—Yes.

4193. Taking the last six months, when you depend upon the home supply for your sales, does the price vary with the period at which the foreign supply is coming in?—As a rule, the beef and mutton both fall in price towards the autumn.

4194. But when the home supply comes into the market the price is reduced?—When the home supply comes into the market the grass fed cattle and sheep come in, and the price is reduced.

Chairman—continued.

We cannot feed either sheep or cattle in this country in sufficient quantities to supply the people in winter time. Mr. Hall, of Liverpool, has asked me to make a statement about the weight of a bullock's liver and heart, about which he was examined. He says that he has had the livers and hearts of 20 American bullocks weighed, and that they average exactly 18 lbs. in weight. He says that it has been stated here that the average weight was 40 lbs.

4195. Was not 40 lbs. mentioned in the evidence as the weight of eatable offal, of which the heart and liver only forms a part?—I do not know. He has written to me this morning, and asked me to mention it.

4196. I think that he must have misunderstood the evidence, because, so far as I understood it, it included everything except the head and the tail?—The head with tongue in it would weigh nearly 40 lbs. It would be only the heart and the liver that was weighed.

4197. However, whatever it is, there is evidently a misapprehension?—Yes.

Mr. Archibald Hamilton, called in; and Examined.

Mr. *Hamilton.*

Chairman.

4198. You are a Flesher, in Glasgow, I believe?—Yes.

4199. Have you been for a long time in the trade?—Yes.

4200. How long?—Since I was a boy; 30 years.

4201. You have been dealing largely during the whole of that time as a butcher?—Yes.

4202. Would you tell the Committee whether for your ordinary supplies, you have generally depended upon Scotch animals, or upon foreign imported animals, or upon Irish animals?—The trade has undergone a great change since the cattle plague of 1865. We used not to kill any beef for the dead-meat market before that, but it has reduced the thing to something of the same sort as it is in London. Now, we have a dead-meat market in Glasgow; and, as wholesale butchers, we buy and supply the dead-meat market with cattle.

4203. And you purchase principally from the home trade?—Yes.

4204. Not from foreign countries?—From both occasionally.

4205. Do you get any of the Denmark cattle?—Yes.

4206. Has the trade from Denmark increased lately?—Yes.

4207. Can you give the Committee any idea of the proportion of the foreign cattle as compared with the home cattle that you slaughter for the dead-meat market?—We only get the foreign cattle during a season; we do not get any during the winter months; and I suppose that during the four or five months that we get them they would be about one-sixth or one-seventh part of the average supply in the Glasgow market at that time.

4208. Have you found that the cattle coming from those districts come in such a condition and in such order that they fairly compete with the other meat in the market?—Yes, they sell readily.

Chairman—continued.

4209. They are a supply upon which you can rely for a good sale?—Yes.

4210. In killing wholesale for the dead-meat market do you find any difficulty in slaughtering during the hot times of the year?—No, we can kill them at any time we find it convenient.

4211. I suppose that you kill largely for the daily supply?—Yes.

4212. And you have no difficulty in dealing with your home cattle in killing for that dead-meat market?—Yes.

4213. With regard to this American meat, has your attention been called to that?—Yes.

4214. Have you yourself dealt in that meat?—Yes.

4215. To any great extent?—Yes.

4216. Is that through the consignments of Mr. Bell?—Yes.

4217. Can you state the condition in which that meat has arrived generally?—Yes.

4218. In what condition has it arrived?—In very good order, indeed.

4219. Has that been so as a rule, or have the consignments varied?—As a rule I have had those consignments in very good condition.

4220. To what extent have you had them?—Last week I bought 10,000 lbs. weight of it.

4221. Is it a steady trade, or does it vary?—The week previously it would be a little less; but I have been doing a trade of from 6,000 lbs. or 7,000 lbs. up to 10,000 lbs., these two or three months past.

4222. So that you have been now for some time steadily dealing in this American meat?—For the last 12 months.

4223. And that would include periods of hot weather last year, and the short time of hot weather that we have had this summer?—Yes.

4224. Have you found any difficulty in dealing with the meat when the weather has been hot?—If you buy too much you take your chance of the market.

Mr. *Hamilton.*

13 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

4225. What has been your experience with regard to the time for which you can keep this American dead meat after it has been taken out of the refrigerators in which it has travelled?—It will keep nearly as long as the home meat, so far as taint is concerned, but it loses colour.

4226. You would endorse what Mr. Gillett, of Liverpool, stated here the other day, viz., that after meat that he had inspected was taken out of the cold chamber he could hang it as against the fresh killed meat?—I do, from practical knowledge.

4227. From that practical knowledge, you believe that this trade, even in hot weather, will become a permanent supply to the country?—Yes.

4228. You say that the consignments that have been imported by Messrs. Bell, with whom you have dealt, have not varied in condition, as has been described to take place in other districts?—We have two lines of vessels from New York, and one brings the meat in better order than the other; but the latter one has only been recently started.

4229. Do both of them come direct to Glasgow?—Yes, the Anchor Line, and what they call the States Line. One brings better meat than the other.

4230. But the fact of their being able to bring a continuous supply of meat in good condition leads you to think that, as soon as the conditions of the trade are properly ascertained, they will be able to bring over meat in such a condition as to compete in the market?—That is already proved.

4231. And it is proved to your satisfaction also that that meat will keep, even after it is taken away from the influence of the cold atmosphere in which it is brought over, as against English meat?—Yes, but it loses colour; it will scarcely compete with fresh meat to bring the same price.

4232. That would be a salesman's difficulty; but have you found that your customers to whom this meat has been supplied have complained of the quality or condition of the meat?—No.

4233. They have taken it in the same way that they take your Scotch meat, or English meat, or Irish meat; and they have been so satisfied with it that no complaints as to its quality have ever been made?—No.

4234. Therefore, although it may not look to a butcher's eye in quite as good condition, practically, for consumption it is equally good with the home meat?—Quite so.

4235. In giving this opinion, which is a very valuable one, are you speaking solely from your own experience, or do you come here representing the trade generally who have dealt in this meat at Glasgow?—From both.

4236. Do you represent more than your own individual experience of the trade?—Yes; I can show you a letter that I have here (*handing in a letter*).

4237. This is a letter from one Mr. Eastman, of New York, who consigns nearly four-fifths of the whole of the beef to Messrs. John Bell & Sons, and it is an entire contradiction to the opinion which has been expressed that this supply would not be a permanent one?—Clearly.

4238. It is stated by the exporter in America, and endorsed by the agent in Glasgow, Mr. Bell, and by your own opinion, not only that the trade will be a continuous one, but that the meat will be brought over in such a condition as to be absolutely serviceable for consumption even during the hot weather?—It is quite likely.

Chairman—continued.

4239. Do you think that it arrives in such a condition as to be able to travel after it is taken out of these refrigerators, and to be sent as a saleable commodity to retail butchers' shops over the country?—Certainly it would, but the weather affects it. If the weather is hot it is dangerous; but I have sent many thousands of pounds of it to the London market myself.

4240. I will not ask at what prices it has been sold, but may I ask if it has fetched a reasonably remunerative price?—Sometimes I have got a good profit, and at other times the market was bad, and I lost heavily; it is very uncertain.

4241. Were those losses, in your opinion, in consequence of the deterioration of the meat from its travelling, or of the fact that the market at the time it arrived happened to be glutted?—The loss arose from the fact that the market at the time that the meat arrived happened to be glutted.

4242. Not from the meat arriving in a condition of depreciated value from its journey?—No.

4243. You would tell the Committee that you have faith, then, in the travelling properties of this meat, even after it has been exposed to the atmospheric influence of this country?—Quite so.

4244. It has been stated by one witness here, I think by Mr. Hall, that the meat, as soon as it is taken out of the refrigerators, was so damp as to spoil its quality for the market; is that your opinion?—It is damp, and it will keep nicely for, it may be, a couple of days; but after that, although it is quite fresh for eating, it will lose its colour; it begins to get a darkish colour, from having been so long in the refrigerator.

4245. Fresh-killed meat in hot weather also assumes that darker colour, does it not?—It will keep a fresh colour longer.

4246. It has been stated by one of the witnesses from America that the reason for its keeping was that the animal heat had been cooled out by the process of preparation, and that, therefore, the atmosphere here did not affect it in the same way as it affected English killed beef, where the animal heat remained in the heart of the joint, and the outside affected by the atmosphere dried; is that your opinion?—It is a thoroughly sound opinion.

4247. Therefore that also tends to show that the American meat can compete, from the process by which it is prepared, with the fresh-killed meat?—There is no doubt of it.

4248. Is there any other point which you would wish to put before the Committee?—I have no suggestion to make. I am only a poor butcher, but anything that you have to ask I shall be glad to answer.

4249. Is there any suggestion that you would wish to make with regard to the American live animal trade?—They complain greatly in Glasgow of the detention that the American cattle are subject to. When they arrive at Glasgow they have to stand over twelve hours; and if they have been 12 or 14 days on the voyage, the sooner they are taken off to good feeding quarters the better.

4250. You

Chairman—continued.

4250. You have been dealing in the import of live cattle from America?—Yes.

4251. Have the animals from America or Canada come over to Glasgow in good order?—I am authorised by Messrs. Bell to say, that previously to last Wednesday they imported, in 15 days, 457 bullocks; and out of that number there were only two deaths, which arose solely from stress of weather.

4252. And they had bad weather on some of those voyages?—They may have had occasionally a stormy day.

4253. Would it not be a very losing concern to send over those animals in the winter months?—It is highly dangerous in the winter; it is only in the summer season that they would send live animals.

4254. And in stormy weather, or in weather in which you are liable to heavy gales, it would be almost impossible to bring over American live meat at a profit?—It would be very dangerous.

4255. But at a time of the year when you are not subject to storms, they arrive in very good order?—In very good order, generally.

4256. And they are a good sound animal?—They are a good sound animal.

4257. The last witness stated that the American meat which he had seen which had come over to this country had been of very varied quality; that some of the import that he had had under his notice was the meat of old bulls and cows as well as of bullocks; has that been your experience?—I have been attending the market closely for the past 12 months, since the American meat trade has been in operation, and I think that on only one or, it may be, two occasions has there been a bull amongst the lot; they have been invariably of the very best quality.

4258. The meat that has come under your notice has been not only in good condition, but of the best quality?—Of the very best quality.

4259. With regard to the live meat, you would suggest that, for what it is worth as an import, which depends, of course, upon the weather, it should not be so restricted as it is at present?—Certainly.

4260. And that no advantage is gained by the detention which it has to undergo, but rather that the meat in the beast is deteriorated by it?—Quite so.

4261. Is there any other suggestion that you would like to make?—We do not like the restrictions at Glasgow at all, we are altogether against them.

4262. I suppose that you are one of those people who like restrictions never to apply at home?—My opinion is that foot-and-mouth disease, particularly, is the direct result of cruelty and bad usage. It is all a great mistake to suppose that it is not brought on by that; it is entirely the result of the bad usage of the cattle.

4263. Do you speak of this from practical experience?—Yes.

4264. Have you seen much of the foot-and-mouth disease?—I have been more or less closely connected with it during all the period that I have been a butcher.

4265. Having seen a great deal of foot-and-mouth disease, you believe that it is produced in many cases by the condition of blood in which the animal is from ill-usage?—I believe that that was the origin of the disease; it is still very contagious; it is just a fever.

Chairman—continued.

4266. At the same time, I suppose, that that would hardly account for the breaking-out of the complaint that occurs among herds where they are neither driven to market nor subject to any particular hardship?—But it may have been brought to them; it is very contagious.

4267. You think that if it was stamped out as a disease it would be reproduced by ill-treatment?—Certainly it would.

4268. Then you are not in favour, I suppose, of any strong restrictions being enforced for the purpose of stamping out foot-and-mouth disease?—Not foot-and-mouth disease; but for cattle plague and pleuro-pneumonia I am.

4269. You are in favour of stricter regulations for the purpose of stamping out either cattle plague or pleuro-pneumonia, the object being to get rid of a disease which diminishes the supply in this country?—Clearly.

4270. And you think, from your knowledge and experience, that such restrictions would be submitted to if you could attain that object?—Yes, with regard to cattle plague and pleuro-pneumonia.

4271. You think that your trade and the consumer's interest suffer by these diseases being allowed to continue in this country?—I believe that the country suffers generally.

4272. Whilst you think that people would submit to strong restrictions for the purpose of getting rid of cattle plague and pleuro-pneumonia, in the case of foot-and-mouth disease you do not approve of additional restrictions?—I do not.

4273. And you do not think that it would be stamped out by those restrictions?—I do not, and there is no science in stamping out at all.

Major *Allen.*

4274. Would you do away with all restrictions in the case of foot and mouth disease?—I would not allow cattle affected with it to be exposed in markets or fairs; but they should be taken to the slaughter-houses without any restrictions to be killed.

4275. Would you allow the animals suffering from-foot-and mouth disease to travel along a highway to a slaughter-house to be killed?—If it was convenient.

4276. Convenient to whom?—I mean if the slaughter-house was not far away, if the danger was reduced to a minimum.

Mr. *Arthur Peel.*

4277. You said that of the two lines that brought American meat, one brought much better meat than the other; can you account for that in any way?—One I think is a better patent than the other. There is some little difference in the mode of fitting up the chamber.

4278. You think that the quality of the meat might be the same in both cases?—I suppose it would.

4279. At all events you think that there is a better arrangement in the one case than the other?—Yes.

4280. You said that foot-and-mouth disease was the direct result of cruelty and ill-usage; have you any suggestion to make as regards the transit of cattle by railway?—It is principally by

Mr. *Hamilton.*

13 June 1877.

Mr. *Arthur Peel*—continued.

by the Irish boats; they are, I consider, the greatest propagators of the disease.

4281. And you think that the steamboat cattle traffic between Ireland and this country is very deficient in proper arrangements?—Certainly.

4282. Between what ports?—We get a great many cattle from Dublin to Glasgow, and from Sligo, and Londonderry, and a few from Belfast.

4283. As to the railway traffic, is there any cruelty to your knowledge?—It is considerably less on the railways. I think if you look at the Report of the Select Committee of 1873, you will find that Professor Fergusson of Dublin says that, although water and fodder was provided at the port of Dublin, the dealers would not allow their beasts to take it for fear of giving them what you call "the scour."

4284. Have you seen cattle landed from Ireland?—Yes.

4285. Have you seen any bad instances?—The cattle are in such a state of thirst that they fly to the nearest gutters and suck up whatever they can get in the shape of water.

4286. You have seen the boats in a bad condition?—There are too many cattle on boar The steam from the beast's breath and other excrescences is dreadful when the hold is opened.

4287. Where are they carried?—Mostly in the hold.

4288. Are they not carried on deck?—Some are.

4289. With a shelter?—The shelter is not very sufficient.

Colonel *Kingscote.*

4290. You are speaking of the different steamers that come to Glasgow only?—Yes.

4291. From your practical experience and knowledge?—Yes, I have seen the cattle landed frequently.

4292. Is it your opinion that, although the cattle are inspected by inspectors before they are put on board the steamers, there is sufficient time between their leaving Ireland and their landing in Glasgow, for foot-and-mouth disease to be generated on board those steamers from what you have described as overcrowding and want of proper arrangements?—Yes, they will be frequently about 18 hours coming from Dublin to Glasgow, and during that time I understand they get nothing.

4293. And you think that that is sufficient to generate foot-and-mouth disease, or at all events, for the disease to develop itself within a week or 10 days?—Very likely it would do so.

4294. Do you consider that that is a source of danger of spreading foot-and-mouth disease throughout England?—Yes, distinctly.

4295. I suppose that the cattle that come from those steamers are not all slaughtered at Glasgow?—No.

4296. Some of them go into the country?—Yes, they do.

4297. And you think that foot-and-mouth disease is propagated in that way?—I think that that is the origin of it, added to the bad usuage they may have got. They may have travelled many miles before, for they are hurried up to the boat, and as Professor Fergusson says, they are not allowed to have food or water for the fear of their scouring.

4298. Are those boats thoroughly disinfected and cleansed after the cattle leave them, or may the seeds of foot-and-mouth disease be left on board of them?—That is a scientific question which I should not like to answer.

Colonel *Kingscote*—continued.

4299. I understand you to think very lightly of foot-and-mouth disease?—Yes.

4300. Have you ever had experience of it among breeding animals?—I have had some experience of it among grazing animals; they soon get over it, if it is a light attack.

4301. Does it not throw them back sometimes?—Yes.

4302. Is it not a loss to your pocket?—It is a loss.

4303. You know nothing about the loss to breeding animals?—No, I am not a breeder.

Mr. *Anderson.*

4304. Are you not chairman of the United Association of Fleshers in Glasgow?—I am not the chairman at the present time, but I am a member of the society.

4305. Were you not specially selected by the association to come up to give evidence upon this occasion?—Yes.

4306. So that, in fact, you are representing them here?—Yes.

4307. And the opinions that you have been giving us about the American dead-meat trade are not entirely your individual opinions, but they are really the opinions of the Glasgow trade?—Clearly.

4308. The Glasgow trade having a great deal of experience in the matter?—Yes.

4309. When the butchers get American meat to sell, do they sell it without any distinction from English meat?—Yes.

4310. They buy American meat and they buy home meat from the wholesale dealers, and then they hang it up in the shops, and sell it without reference to what it is?—Quite so.

4311. It is not specially ticketed "American"?—No; it is not necessary.

4312. Does it bring the same price as the home-killed beef?—Scarcely.

4313. But the reason for its bringing less money is not because it is stated to be American meat, but simply because it does not look quite so nice?—Exactly.

4314. Have you had any experience of attempting to cure that meat?—I have cured a deal of it.

4315. When it comes into this country from America, is it still in a state fit for curing?—Yes.

4316. I am not sure whether you were present; when evidence was given us by one of the witnesses that it was not fit for curing, that he had endeavoured to supply one of the steamboat companies with meat for their own use that they themselves had brought over, and that they had had to discontinue it because it was utterly unfit for them?—I did not hear that, and I dissent from it.

4317. You have tried it, and it is quite good for curing?—I have tried it, and it is quite good for curing.

4318. With regard to the steam traffic from Ireland to Glasgow, who is responsible for the badness of the arrangements there?—I do not know.

4319. But you understand that the arrangements for carrying on that traffic are thoroughly bad?

Mr. *Anderson*—continued.

bad?—They overcrowd the boats frequently, and the cattle are far too long a time in the vessel without being fed and attended to.

4320. But you do not know who is really to blame for it?—I do not.

4321. These malpractices continue even at the present day, I understand?—Certainly; the reason, I think, why the foreign cattle are less subject to foot-and-mouth disease than the Irish cattle are is, that they get better attention on board the steamers. They have a longer voyage to undergo, and they are better cared for on board the vessel, and they come in better order than the Irish cattle.

4322. Are there not better arrangements made for taking care of them on the way?—Yes.

4323. But you know no reason, do you, why better arrangements might not be made for the shorter voyage?—Clearly not.

4324. It is simply that they aim at cutting the expenses down too low?—That is so.

Mr. *John Holms.*

4325. You say that you have had experience of the American meat in Glasgow from the very first?—Yes, from 12 months ago.

4326. Was it as good at first as it is now?—Just about the same.

4327. Have you any knowledge about the meat that arrives at Liverpool?—I have not.

4328. Is it the case that some arrangements are made, or are being made for bringing dead meat from Austria into Glasgow?—I have not heard of that.

4329. We have had evidence here, that meat which is killed in cold weather, keeps about six weeks; is that so?—That is all a mistake; it depends upon the weather of course, but in cold weather meat can be kept freely in this country for a fortnight or thereabouts.

4330. And in hot weather, how long will it keep?—About a week is enough then.

Mr. *Chamberlain.*

4331. What is the lowest price at which the American meat has been sold in Glasgow?—On only one occasion it was sold at 1¾ *d.* per lb. for fore quarters.

4332. Has it often been sold below 5 *d.* per lb.?—It has never been sold on an average of the carcase below 5 *d.* per lb., I believe, that is the hind and the fore quarters together.

4333. What does it generally fetch?—About 6 *d.* to 5½ *d.* per lb.

4334. And you think that that is a price which pays the American exporter?—I am authorised by the party who sends it to say, that the trade is going to continue, so that it is likely that it pays.

4335. You say that you yourself have incurred some losses in sending American meat to London?—I have.

4336. And you say that that was owing to its arriving at a time when there was a glut of meat upon the market?—Clearly so.

4337. That will continually occur in the case of the dead meat trade, will it not?—Yes, it is likely to happen.

4338. And you think that, in spite of the continual recurrence of occasions of loss like that, the trade will still go on?—Yes. It may be just double one morning what it is another.

Mr. *Chamberlain*—continued.

4339. The profits on good days will pay for the losses on bad days?—Yes.

4340. Has the introduction of American meat into Glasgow reduced the price of meat there?—Imperceptibly as yet.

4341. You do not think that you could do without the supply of live cattle?—No, we need the live cattle.

4342–3. You do not suggest that the dead-meat trade would ever be a substitute for the trade in live catle?—No. Between American meat alive and American meat dead of the same quality, there is 14 *s.* difference in value.

4344. You think that the two trades would go on together?—Yes.

4345. And you think that in the supply of a great town like Glasgow, you could not safely rely upon the dead-meat trade alone?—No, you need both.

Mr. *French.*

4346. I understood you to say that you had had a very long experience of foot-and-mouth disease?—Yes.

4347. Do you think that foot-and-mouth disease is produced by the ill-treatment of the animal as much as by contagion?—I think ill-treatment causes it first, but it is very contagious; it is difficult to say which it comes from.

4348. Have you ever known an instance in which ill-treatment has produced foot-and-mouth disease without contagion?—Cattle shipped at Dublin have been certified to be perfectly sound, and when they came to Glasgow they were suffering from foot-and-mouth disease. That may have been an overlook on the part of the inspector.

4349. Have you ever known an instance besides that?—I suppose that there have been frequent instances of it.

4350. You never knew one yourself?—No, I do not import.

4351. Have you ever had an instance come under your knowledge of an animal that got foot-and-mouth disease merely from being ill-treated?—The cattle are certified to be sound when they are shipped, and I have seen them with the foot-and-mouth disease on the very day they were landed.

Mr. *Ritchie.*

4352. What proportion does the importation of American meat bear to the consumption at Glasgow?—The Messrs. Bell have imported 12,000,000 lbs. during the last 12 months.

4353. What was the consumption of meat altogether in Glasgow during that time?—I never summed up what the total consumption would be.

4354. You do not know what proportion the American dead meat bears to the consumption in Glasgow?—It might be one-sixth or one-seventh.

4355. Do you believe that it is as much as one-sixth or one-seventh?—I should think so from the number of cattle killed.

4356. You are not prepared to speak as to that?—No.

4357. What effect do you think that it would have upon the price of meat in Glasgow if the importation of live animals were prohibited?—It would be likely to raise the price.

4358. You do not believe that it would be

Mr. *Hamilton.*

13 June 1877.

Mr. *Ritchie*—continued.

made up by the increased importation of dead meat?—No, because the dead meat sells at a cheaper price than the same article killed in Glasgow.

Mr. *King-Harman.*

4359. In the case of those American cattle that you import, have you to finish them after they land?—No, they are well finished.

4360. But you say that they have been so many days on board ship, and then they have to remain 12 hours before they can be removed; do you move them then straight to the slaughter-house, or do you put them on the grass?—It is advisable to give them a little feeding to replenish them after being so long on board.

4361. But that is simply to freshen them after the voyage, and not that they want any extra finish?—Yes.

4362. In the same way with the Danish cattle; do you have to finish them at all?—No, they are all ready. They are in a little fever, and they are better for being rested.

4363. Were there not two or three instances, when the dead-meat trade was first started, in which cargoes came in bad order to Glasgow; was there not a whole cargo lost on one or two occasions?—No.

4364. Not during the very hot weather of last year?—No, there was only one occasion where a cargo was sold at a reduced price.

4365. Was none condemned?—None was condemned.

Mr. *Dease.*

4366. Do you buy any large quantity of Irish cattle?—Yes.

4367. Do they hold a high place in the market at Glasgow?—They are regarded as very useful beasts.

4368. Is it your opinion that beef could, with advantage be imported from Ireland in a dead state, as it now is from America?—The thing is practicable, but I do not think that it would pay. Dead meat brings about 1 *d.* to 1½ *d.* per pound, according to circumstances, less than the same articles killed fresh would do; and that is a serious tax.

4369. It would be, then, a direct loss?—Certainly it would.

4370. Would the difference of the offal make up that loss?—There is too much made of the offal, the offal is but a small thing. The offal consists more of the hide and tallow, which is always saleable, and the balance, the tripe and the heart, and so on, is made up into preserved meat. Too much is made of that question altogether.

4371. How much would the offal of a beast weighing say, 6 cwt. be worth?—Just about 3 *l.* It averages about 1 *d.* per pound on the weight of the animal.

4372. That would make up the difference in value between the live and dead meat, would it not?—No; I am not speaking of the value of the carcase irrespective of the offal. Were we to get beef from Ireland in the carcase it would be 1 *d.* per pound less than the animal would bring in the market, and then 1 *d.* to ¾ *d.* less again.

4373. It is your opinion, therefore, that it would be a direct loss to import the meat in a dead state from Ireland?—Certainly.

Mr. *James Corry.*

4374. Is it from Canada or from the United States that the live stock is imported?—From both.

4375. Are you aware whether arrangements are being made to carry on that importation of live stock all the year round?—It is only during the summer season that it can be imported with safety; the weather is so boisterous during winter that it would be very unsafe, and the insurance would be very high.

4376. Then you do not think that it would be possible during the winter months to import live stock to compete with the dead-meat trade?—No, it must be stopped during the winter months.

4377. The difference of freight would be very considerable between the live stock and the dead meat, would it not?—Very, and that is where the difficulty is.

4378. Are you aware whether they are fitting up the ships in that trade for carrying live stock?—I have heard so.

4379. You do not know of your own knowledge?—No.

4380. You say that, of the live stock when killed in Glasgow, the meat brings about 1 ½ *d.* per pound more than the imported dead meat?—Yes.

4381. Does that represent the difference in freight?—Yes, just about that.

4382. What is the freight of the dead meat from the United States to Glasgow?—I fancy it is about 7 *s.* or 8 *s.* per cwt., all expenses round.

4383. What is it on the live stock?—I am told that it costs from 8 *l.* to 10 *l.* a bullock to bring them.

4384. What is the average value of the bullocks when they are landed in Glasgow?—About 25 *l.* apiece.

4385. You have no fear but that a trade from America will be continued to Glasgow, both in dead meat and live stock?—Not the slightest; I have written authority from the folks in New York to say so.

4386. I suppose that the Messrs. Bell are the largest importers?—They are the only importers; that is to say, they are agents for the importers.

Mr. *M'Lagan.*

4387. Have you any experience of the importation of dead meat from any other country than America?—No, none comes to Glasgow.

4388. Does any dead meat come from the north of Scotland to Glasgow?—A small supply, but very trifling.

4389. How does that sell?—It sells pretty fairly, but at a little reduction from what our own killed meat brings; it sells at a lower value.

4390. You are aware, are you not, that large quantities of meat are sent from Scotland to London?—Yes.

4391. Does it bring less in the London market than the beef from the Scotch cattle that are sent and killed in London?—I am told not.

4392. Then, if it makes no difference in the price of the meat sold in London whether the meat from Scotland is sent dead or alive to London, why should it make a difference in the price whether dead meat is sent from Ireland to Glasgow, or whether live stock are sent from Ireland to Glasgow?—In London they want the meat every

Mr. *M'Lagan*—continued.

every morning for these cookshops, and what not, and they just buy one day's supply, consequently if there is an overstock to-morrow the price may fall from 20 to 30 per cent., and on the following day it may rise as much. The thing is very unequal and very uncertain. It is more advisable altogether to have the live cattle.

4393. I understand from the answer which you gave to the honourable Member on my left, that the difference between the prices of the dead and live meat in Glasgow arises not so much from the deterioration in the quality of the dead meat as from the loss that is sustained from the meat not being sold in time in Glasgow?—Exactly.

4394. But if there was a sufficient demand in Glasgow the meat would arrive quite as fresh from Ireland, if it was sent dead from Ireland, would it not?—It would arrive, perhaps, not quite so fresh as meat which is killed there.

4395. It would not make much difference in the value, would it?—It makes a difference in the value.

4396. The bloom would be off it, I suppose?—That is it.

4397. From the success of the importation of American dead meat into Glasgow, you think that it might be extended with great advantage to the public in this country?—Yes.

4398. Not only from America, but also from other parts of the world?—More so from America on account of the great difference of the freight in live and dead meat; the difference in freight, say from Germany, would not be very much, but from the long voyage of the live cattle, and being attended by bullock men, and getting fodder for 14 or 16 days, the freight is a very serious thing; it costs over 1 *l.* per cwt. to bring them from New York.

4399. Is there not a great difference also in the freight from Hamburg, and also from other ports of the Continent, between dead meat and live cattle?—No, dead meat comes to Glasgow from Hamburg.

4400. Why should there not be the same difference in the freight of dead meat and of live cattle from other countries, as well as from America?—The reason is that they can bring the meat from New York at about from 7 *s.* or 8 *s.* per cwt., and I fancy it would cost as much, or perhaps more, to bring it from Hamburg.

4401. Supposing, then, that the freight should be in proportion to the distance from Hamburg, do you see any reason why we should not extend the dead-meat trade to the Continent, as well as to America?—It would not pay.

4402. If the freight was in proportion, would it not pay?—No.

4403. Then you think that America is the only country from which we may expect to have dead meat, so far as your experience and knowledge go?—Clearly so.

4404. Do you think that the American dead-meat trade could be extended so much as to make us quite independent of having any live stock at all from America?—You would have plenty of meat, but people would prefer fresh killed meat.

4405. But you think that we can get abundance of that second quality of meat from America to supply the people of Glasgow with good sound meat?—No doubt; there is no fear of starvation, but they prefer fresh killed meat.

4406. Without any importation of live stock whatever?—There is no doubt of it.

Mr. *Torr.*

4407. You said, did you not, that there was a difference of 1½ *d.* per pound between the dead meat and the live meat?—That is in reference to the American meat. I proved it last week when I bought both the live and dead meat, and that is the difference that I paid; so that it is no matter of opinion, but a certainty.

4408. Is the quality of those two meats the same?—Yes, I believe they are equal.

4409. The quality of the dead meat is as good as the quality of the live meat?—Yes, the beasts were originally equally good.

4410. And yet there is a difference of 1½ *d.* per pound?—Yes.

4411. How do you account for that?—From the fact of its being 14 or 15 days killed.

4412. Do you not think that a good portion of that 1½ *d.* is from prejudice?—I am referring to the market value. The meat in Glasgow is all sold by public roup, and those are the prices that it fetched.

4413. Do you not think that when the public of Glasgow have got accustomed to this dead meat imported from America, the difference between the price of the two articles will diminish?—The Glasgow folks have had a large experience, 12,000,000 lbs. have been imported, and they have had it for a full year there.

4414. But you admit that probably the dead meat will improve in its mode of transit?—It is quite likely that it may be improved upon, but I could not hazard an opinion. It comes in very good order just now.

4415. If it were to improve in condition, the difference in price between the live and dead meat would naturally diminish, would it not?—One would argue that; but fresh meat always commands a relatively higher price than meat which has been killed a fortnight will command.

4416. Do you know sufficient of the dead-meat trade with America to say whether it has been a paying or a losing trade?—It is a delicate question. I do not know sufficient of the facts. I do not myself import; I buy at the public auctions and sell it again.

Chairman.

4417. With reference to what I understood you to say in answer to the honourable Member for Glasgow, with regard to the carrying trade from Ireland, you are aware that within the last few years certain alterations have been made in that trade, and that an inspection takes place now with regard to those vessels for the purpose of seeing that what you describe as over crowding does not take place, and seeing also that the fittings are proper; when the vessel comes in she is liable to be inspected to see that she has fulfilled the conditions for the proper carrying of cattle?—They are very necessary.

4418. Are you aware that that has been the case since 1874?—Yes, I believe it is the case.

4419. Are you aware that those fittings, and the condition of the vessels, has very materially improved since 1874?—I believe that they have improved a little, but there is still more improvement needed.

Mr. *Hamilton.*

13 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

4420. The condition of those vessels has not been allowed to remain what it was, but they have been regulated by inspection and improved for this carrying trade?—I suppose so.

4421. I understood you just now to say that the fresh meat commands, as a rule, a higher price, and that people prefer fresh killed meat?—Certainly.

4422. I understood you, in answer to a previous question, to say that a very large amount of this American meat was sold to the customers, and that no difference was discovered by them as between the American meat and the Scotch or English meat?—It is sold at a lower price than Scotch beef.

4423. Do you mean to say that you sell to the customers this American meat at a lower price than the Scotch meat?—Certainly.

4424. And that they have it with a knowledge that it is American meat, and buy it because it is cheaper?—Yes.

4425. It is not, as was suggested by a witness from London the other day, substituted for Scotch and English meat, and sold as such?—Nothing of that kind; we are too honest in Glasgow for that.

4426. It has been stated that the meat is in such good order that the consumers do not detect the difference as between American and English meat; is that the case in Glasgow?—A person on having no experience could not be expected to detect the difference, but a butcher or a man of capacity would know at once.

Chairman—continued.

4427. The consumer is not in a position to decide as to whether the joint which is sent to him by a butcher is American or English beef, because, as you say, the American meat is of equally good quality?—They will soon learn.

4428. But at the present moment they have not discovered that?—Plenty of people can detect the difference.

4429. The consumers can?—Yes.

4430. You believe that that will prevent its coming into competition at the same price with English and Scotch beef?—It will sell as American meat at its relative value, but not as home meat.

4431. And yet it is in sufficiently good order, and it keeps as long as the English killed meat, and is of sufficiently good quality to compete with it in the market?—Yes, at its price. You know there is no beef so good as the Scotch beef, and it will not bring the same price as that.

Mr. JOHN PRINCE SHELDON, called in; and Examined.

Mr. *Sheldon.*

Chairman.

4432. I BELIEVE you live in Staffordshire?—I do, close to the borders of Derbyshire.

4433. What is your occupation?—I am a Farmer.

4434. Are you a dairy farmer or a grazier?—Both.

4435. Are you at all acquainted with the American system of farming?—I have passed a few weeks in the States, and the time was principally passed in examining the American system of farming.

4436. You have, in fact, studied the system under which they farm there?—Yes, to greater or lesser extent.

4437. Have you investigated this American meat trade?—I have in England, but not in the States.

4438. And you have been collecting statistics, I think, relating to it?—Yes.

4439. The object of that has been with the view of making a report upon it to the Royal Agricultural Society, has it not?—It has.

4440. Can you give the Committee, from your experience in America, any idea as to the number of cattle, sheep, and pigs in the United States?—In round numbers there are 28,000,000 cattle of all kinds in the States; 36,000,000 sheep, and 26,000,000 pigs.

4441. What number would that give as available annually for slaughter?—It would give something like 8,000,000 cattle annually available for slaughter, 12,000,000 sheep, and 20,000,000 pigs.

4442. Can you state what the average weight of the animals was?—Those that are sent to England average about one-third of a ton net; about three to a ton.

4443. Can you state what available balance there is for export from America?—If the Americans were to eat as much as we do in England, that is, 100 lbs. per head of the population, they could, out of their surplus stock spare us considerably more meat than we in England eat altogether.

Chairman—continued.

4444. What is the present population of the United States?—It is estimated to be now 44,000,000.

4445. Did you at all make yourself acquainted with the cost of rearing and feeding a bullock in America?—No, but I have reliable information as to the cost from men in America.

4446. Is that information obtained from men upon whose accuracy you can depend?—Yes, one of them is Professor Morrow of the Illinois Industrial University, and if you will allow me I will read a short extract from his letter on that point. He says, "Corn can be produced for, say from 20 to 25 cents per bushel of 56 lbs. of shelled corn. A steer weighing 1,500 lbs. will have eaten about 100 bushels of corn. This has been fed to him unground, unshelled, and often unhusked; the stalks, if they have been kept in good condition, being valued as not far inferior to hay. The only other food has been grass in summer and a little hay in bad weather in winter. This steer will be worth here from 75 dollars to 90 dollars, and will give a good profit. Or a steer, two years old, thin in flesh, may be purchased now for about 30, weighing say 900 lbs. During the summer he will be grazed, and next winter will be fed, perhaps 35 or 40 bushels of corn, and be sold either during the winter or in summer for about 60 dollars or perhaps 70 dollars;" that is to say, from 12 *l.* to 14 *l.* From the Province of Ontario, I have a calculation that the cost of raising and fattening a steer

Chairman—continued.

a steer, which, when fat, would weigh 1,600 lbs. gross, would amount to 66 dollars or 13 *l.* 4 *s.* A beast of that size, net weight, would weigh 912 lbs., and that at 6 *d.* per lb., would come to a little over 22 *l.* 10 *s.*

4447. We may take that then to be the average cost of a fed bullock?—Yes, I think from 60 to 70 dollars.

4448. There is a considerable railway transit before you bring him to the slaughter-house, is there not?—Yes, there is a considerable railway transit. From Chicago to New York, which is a distance of 900 to 1,000 miles, the railway transit amounts to eight dollars per head of cattle, or 32 *s.* That does not include feeding and attention on the way.

4449. Can you state what the actual cost, including everything, would add to the purchase price of a beast before you got him to New York?—Certainly not more than 2 *l.* per beast, including freight.

4450. Then there is the process of slaughtering and packing in New York?—Slaughtering alone is estimated to cost, on the average, 25 cents, or about 1 *s.* per head, and the packing will be about the same, I presume.

4451. That is the process by which the beasts are prepared there before they are sent over?—Yes. The slaughtering alone would cost 1 *s.*, and the process perhaps another 1 *s.*

4452. Would that include the whole cost before the carcase was placed on board ship?—Yes, I believe so.

4453. You have, I suppose, gone into the question of the way in which they bring over the meat at present from America?—Yes, I have inspected the meat on board several ships in Liverpool.

4454. We have had it described in evidence here, that the process of refrigerating the meat after slaughter takes place before they put it on board ship for transit to this country?—Yes, the carcases, after the beasts are killed, are prepared on shore, and they sometimes remain there for two or three days before they are but on board ship.

4455. I want to know what the cost of all this preliminary process would be which you would have to add to the cost of the live meat?—I have not been able to ascertain the exact cost of that preliminary process, but it cannot be much, taking it on the average.

4456. Then there is the freight on the dead meat; what is that?—The ocean transit of dead meat costs about 30 *s.* per carcase, or about a half-penny per pound.

4457. Does that cover the expense of the displacement by the chamber in which the meat is conveyed, and the ice and everything that maintains the temperature during the passage?—That is based upon the ship's measurement of displacement. One carcase weighing one-third of a ton is supposed to occupy what is called a ton space on board ship; there is so much space lost in hanging.

4458. It has been stated in evidence before this Committee that certain cargoes have arrived when not too closely packed in perfect order, but that again when the trade in America wish, for the purpose of reducing the price, to send over too large a supply, you get the meat too closely packed, and deterioration takes place; do you agree in that?—That is a mistake; in the

Chairman—continued.

cargoes I have inspected the quarters were packed closely, "interlocked," to avoid bruising by the roll and pitch of the ship.

4459. I wanted to know whether you were giving this allowance of space on the idea that it was one of the cargoes that arrived in perfect condition?—This would be an average estimate, of course; sometimes the meat would be packed closely, and at other times it would not; but its being packed closely does not interfere with the keeping properties of the meat.

4460. You say that one carcase is calculated to occupy a ton of space; is that calculation framed upon a cargo which has come over, and which experience has shown to have been delivered in good condition?—I could not say that.

4461. But you do not know whether that allowance of space is the proper allowance?—I cannot say that, but I presume that it is.

4462. We have got the average price of the animal to be 14 *l.*?—Yes.

4463. We have got the carriage of it to New York to be about 2 *l.*, including all expenses?—Yes.

4464. Then there are the expenses of about 2 *s.*, or something more, to get the carcase on board the ship?—Yes.

4465. And then there is carriage of the carcase in the ship to this country?—The carriage from New York to this country is about 30 *s.* on the average.

4466. That brings it to about 18 *l.*, does it not?—Yes, about 18 *l.*; that might be taken as the fair average, I think, for the delivery in Liverpool.

4467. Could you compare that with the cost of bringing over the live animal?—I have done so. The charges of the steam-ship companies per head of live cattle are 35 dollars, or 7 *l.*

4468. Is that the regular price, or is it a Canadian price?—That is the Canadian price.

4469. I think we understood a witness to say that it was less from other parts?—I should doubt it, because the distance is shorter from the Canadian ports than from the United States ports.

4470. It was stated that competition, or something of that kind, had reduced it to 5 *l.* or 6 *l.*; are you aware whether that is so?—I have my information from three or four different sources, and they exactly agree that it is 35 dollars, or 7 *l.* per head; besides which, the exporter has to pay 3 dollars per head for fittings on board, and 5 dollars per head for attendance and food; that brings it to 43 dollars, or 8 *l.* 12 *s.*

4471. And you would have to add that to the 16 *l.* which it had cost to rear and fatten the beast, and to bring it to New York?—Yes.

4472. So that the profit on the dead meat to the exporter is very considerable?—Very considerable.

4473. Can you tell the Committee whether there is more than one process in use by which the meat is being sent over from that country?—There are two or three rival processes still in use, and one or two have been discontinued, I understand; but I have only personally inspected one of them, which is generally taken to be the best.

4474. At what port?—At Liverpool.

4475. Is that the process that was described to the Committee the other day by Mr. Gillett as the one by which the chamber was kept cool

Mr. Sheldon.

13 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

by ice being forced through tubes?—No; it is not that process.

4476. What is the process which you yourself have inspected?—It is generally known as the "dry air" process. The air is made to pass through the ice-room, and then it is made to pass through the meat-room, and a continuous circulation of air is kept up in that way.

4477. Have you tested the meat coming over under this process, as compared with the meat which is sent over by the other process?—I have not.

4478. But you can speak with regard to the condition in which the meat arrives under the process that you have inspected?—Yes; I have been present when the meat-room has been opened at Liverpool.

4479. Would you describe to the Committee whether the meat was in sound condition when it was brought out?—Yes; the meat was simply in perfect condition. There was scarcely even a faint odour that was disagreeable; certainly not more than you would find in an ordinary butcher's shop, and scarcely so much. The meat was quite firm, and not discoloured; and the juices of the meat I found had not run so as to discolor the cloth which is wrapped round the meat.

4480. Do you know whether the same process is adopted in America with regard to this import that has been described as regards the preparation of the meat after the slaughter?—Yes; it is used in the preparation of the meat, I know; but whether it is used by all I do not know.

4481. In both cases the meat after slaughter is cooled down before it is put on board the ship?—Yes; in all cases it is cooled down.

4482. So as to get rid of the animal heat, which might otherwise produce deterioration?—Yes.

4483. You state that you have tested this particular mode of bringing it over?—Yes; I have examined and inspected the ship, and the meat rooms, and the meat itself.

4484. But you do not compare it with the other mode?—I cannot. I have not inspected the other at present.

4485. I understood you to say that you inspected the meat on arrival, and that then there were no signs of its being in any way the worse for its voyage?—Not the slightest signs.

4486. Did you follow that meat at all, so as to be able to test whether, after it had left that chamber, it could resist the new atmospheric influence?—Yes, I did in one case. I went over the steam-ship "Celtic," in Liverpool, in March; and on the following day, in Manchester, I purchased, for experiment, a piece of beef that was brought over by that ship. I was careful, of course, first to ascertain that the meat had been brought by that ship. I took the meat home, and kept it for several days before cooking it, and it was kept several days afterwards before it was finished, and I invited several friends to taste it, and, both warm and cold, the meat was very good.

4487. You did not discover in it what has been described by one witness as any falling off in flavour when the meat got cold after being cooked?—No, it did not fall off at all; it ate like ordinary good English beef when it was cold.

4488. There was nothing in what you saw to lead you to think that it would not be able to compete fairly with English meat in the market?—I considered, and so did my friends, that it would compete on even terms with English beef, so far as quality and flavour went, from a consumer's point of view.

Chairman—continued.

4489. In the time during which you hung this meat, after having purchased it, did you see any sign of its deteriorating or decaying?—There was no distinct sign of decay beyond the fatty portions of it becoming a little discolored; they went a little reddish.

4490. You have never tested the thing so as to see whether the same thing happened to fresh killed meat when hung?—Not to the extent that it does to the American meat.

4491. Was the experiment which you made tested during the hot weather, or in the cold months?—It was in the month of March, but not in good keeping weather just then.

4492. Was it in what people call muggy weather?—In muggy weather.

4493. During the time that it remained exposed to the air, and therefore exposed to the new atmospheric influence, you saw no signs to convince you that it could not come as an article of food into this country?—No, not any.

4494. And you say, also, that its cooking qualities are not inferior to those of English killed meat?—It is quite up to the average of English beef, I think.

4495. Under those circumstances what do you, yourself, after looking at the whole question, consider will be the future of this trade?—The trade is destined to increase to an extent that I am not able to give an opinion of at all; but certainly to a very large extent.

4496. I understand you to found your opinion upon the fact that they have in America a supply which is almost unlimited, and far in excess of their own actual wants for consumption, and that they can produce it at such a price as to be able to send it over here at a remunerative profit to compete with the English beef?—Undoubtedly. For a long time to come the American production of meat may be considered to be practically unlimited, and at the present prices they will send it over to us very freely.

4497. I suppose you mean by the present prices a price of between $5\frac{1}{2}$ *d.* and 6 *d.*, which they have described to be remunerative?—Yes.

4498. Do you think that at a price of 6 *d.* per pound the Americans will be able to keep the market fully supplied?—Yes, at the present prices as they go; of course they fluctuate a little, but, taking them altogether at the present prices, when the arrangements are completed, the Americans will send us, I think, as much meat as we want.

4499. What, in your opinion, was the reason of the losses that have been stated to have been incurred on a number of cargoes that have come over in consequence of the meat not being in good condition; was it from an accident, or was it one of those permanent conditions to which the trade will always be liable?—You could only regard it as a permanent condition, in so far as a possible accident may be so regarded, as a thing that will occur now and then; but I believe that in almost if not in all the cases in which meat has turned bad on board ship it has been owing hitherto either to an accident or to an insufficient supply of ice.

4500. In fact, you endorse the statement which has been made that the trade is in its infancy, and making

Chairman—continued.

making experiments?—Yes, they are gradually feeling their way now.

4501. And, therefore, when it does occasionally happen that a cargo comes over in bad condition, it is not from a fault in the system under which it might be sent, but it is from one of the accidents of the undeveloped condition of the trade?—It is from no fault that can be attached to the system, but from some details having perhaps been overlooked, or from some accident.

4502. Do you think that experience will in time do away with these defects, and that a permanent trade, without fluctuations from such losses, will be secured?—In my own mind, I have not the slightest doubt of that.

4503. Do you think that these prices, when the trade is so secured, will be maintained in England?—That depends upon the amount of meat that the Americans send to us; of course if they send to us a very great quantity the prices will go down.

4504. In your own judgment, from the way you have studied it, do you think that this is merely an experiment to establishing a market, or do you think that it is a permanent remunerative price, which will keep the trade in existence, when once it is established?—I think that the trade has already passed out of the boundary of experiment, and has become an established branch of commerce.

4505. And you do not think that when once the trade is established, and there is some dependence upon it in this country, the prices will then rush up suddenly?—I do not think it is at all likely that they will.

4506. But it will be still sufficiently remunerative in America to make it worth their while to send the meat over at the same prices?—Yes, I think so.

4507. Have you any statistics which you could give the Committee which would confirm your opinion that this trade would be a permanent one?—I have some figures which I think will tend to show that the trade is no longer an experimental one. The first American dead meat was sent over from New York in October 1875, to the amount of 36,000 lbs. weight; it was the same amount the following month; and in December it went up to 134,000 lbs. weight of fresh beef.

4508. Are you thinking of the whole import into the country, or only of the import into Liverpool?—I am speaking of the whole export from America to this country. In January it went up to 162,000 lbs.; in February it was 292,000 lbs.; in March it was 302,000 lbs.; in April it was 1,256,000 lbs.; in May it was 1,012,000 lbs.; in June it was 1,140,000 lbs.; in July it was 1,170,200 lbs.; in August it was 1,365,000 lbs.; in September it was 2,451,550 lbs.; in October it was 2,569,075 lbs.; in November it was 2,974,480 lbs.; in December it was 3,036,900 lbs.; in January of the present year, it was 1,796,000 lbs.; in February it was 3,605,610 lbs.; in March it was 6,262,355 lbs.; and in April it was 6,022,013 lbs. That is from New York alone. The export of mutton does not appear to be sufficiently important to induce the Government at Washington to give the statistics of it at present. From Philadelphia the trade commenced last October, the trade from New York having commenced in the previous

Chairman—continued.

October. From Philadelphia last October were sent 150,610 lbs.; in November, 1,219,500 lbs.; in December, 737,500 lbs.; in January, 776,450 lbs.; in February, 1,348,000 lbs; and March, 445,500 lbs.; and in April 2,546,200 lbs. were sent.

4509. Those figures show a steady progress in this trade?—Yes, except for fluctuations.

4510. And they show also, that during the hot weather no perceptible difference has been made, because the progress was still steady?—Yes.

4511. In your opinion, does the hot weather make any real difference in the possibility of this trade becoming permanent?—Not the slightest, so far as transit is concerned.

4512. Do you agree with the witness who stated that the cargo that came over in the best condition, came over in the hottest weather of last year, both in New York and in England?—I believe it is quite possible that the best cargo might have come then.

4513. There is nothing in fact in the nature of the weather to interfere with the trade?—Not in the slightest.

4514. Have you at all thought of the question as to the importation of live cattle from the continent?—Being a farmer myself, I am naturally interested in that question.

4515. What are your own views upon it?—I consider that the importation of cattle into England, from the continent, ought to be totally prohibited.

4516. You found that opinion upon the ground of wishing, by that prohibition, to eradicate cattle diseases from this country?—Yes, on that ground, and, of course, on that ground alone.

4517. And you believe that those restrictions would really eradicate those diseases?—Yes, I believe that those contagious diseases would soon pass away from this country, if the importation of cattle were prohibited.

Mr. *Ritchie.*

4518. Are you referring to cattle plague, or to the other diseases as well?—To cattle plague more particularly, but I would include also the others.

4519. Of course you are aware of the fact that pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease are very widely spread throughout the country now?—Yes, I am quite aware that those two diseases may almost be considered as naturalised to the country now, and I am afraid that cattle plague will soon be naturalised to the country unless something is done to prevent its re-introduction.

4520. I understand you to say that you think that the importation of cattle should be absolutely stopped, in consequence of the danger of the importation of cattle plague?—Yes.

4521. Dealing with the other two diseases, pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease, do you think that the importation of cattle should be stopped also in consequence of them?—I do not think that it is so necessary with regard to those two diseases as with regard to cattle plague.

4522. It is solely on the ground of protecting the country against cattle plague that you would impose these restrictions?—Mostly on that ground.

4523. I suppose you would admit that the

Mr. *Sheldon.*

13 June 1877.

Mr. *Ritchie*—continued.

country is at present in a great measure dependent upon the foreign supply?—Yes, and it always will be, so long as our own flocks and herds are destroyed by diseases coming from foreign countries.

4524. But it would take some time in case of any restrictions being imposed before our own flocks and herds could be increased very largely I suppose?—Yes, it would take us some time, and it would require a good deal of care, to eradictate those diseases which have become almost natural to the country now, such as foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia.

4525. Supposing restrictions to be imposed in this country to stamp out those diseases, and your idea being carried out of stopping the import from abroad, how would you propose to meet the consumption in the country during the interval between the time of your stopping the import and the growth of your home supply?—They must send us their meat dead as the Americans do.

4526. Do you believe that that trade could be created on the Continent?—I cannot see why it should not be created on the Continent.

4527. I suppose you would admit that the possibility of a dead-meat trade would depend upon the value of the animal on the Continent combined with the cost of sending the dead meat to this country?—It would equally so depend, I presume, in the live cattle trade.

4528. But where it is possible to get a remunerative trade out of the American meat in consequence of the price of the live animals in that country, it might not be possible to make it a remunerative trade from the Continent if the price of the live animal is very much higher there?—I do not see what that has to do with it at all, because they can certainly bring it cheaper dead than alive.

4529. It was stated in evidence before the Committee of 1873 that the trade between the Continent and this country fluctuated according to the price here and the prices in Paris, and that a load of animals would come as far as Mayence, and wait for a telegram showing what the prices were, before it was directed to either one capital or the other; supposing that the import to this country was entirely stopped, and that we trusted to the dead meat, would not the whole stock go into the open market, which would be the Paris market?—The Paris market would not require the whole of the stock; but even if they took it all, after a short time the prices would go down so low that the Germans would soon begin to try the dead-meat trade with us.

4530. You believe that they would after a time be forced into a dead-meat trade with this country?—I do; and I believe that in a very few years they would wonder why on earth they had not taken it up before.

4531. Do you think that the people of this country during that interval, would suffer from the want of a supply, whilst the new trade was being brought into existence?—I do not think that they would suffer long, for the Germans would very quickly begin the new trade, I believe. They are rather fond of English gold and they would have it.

Mr. *Assheton.*

4532. I want to ask you some questions about

Mr. *Assheton*—continued.

foot-and-mouth disease in your capacity as a dairy farmer and as a grazier; I hope you have not got the disease at present on your farm?—No, I have not got it now, I am thankful to say.

4533. I presume you do not wish to have it?—Not in the slightest.

4534. One or two witnesses, and especially a German gentleman, spoke very slightingly indeed of the disease; he said that it was here to-day and gone to-morrow, and he did not seem to care very much whether it came to his stock or not; is that your view of the disease?—No, indeed it is not. I should rather keep it at a very respectable distance, if possible.

4535. Supposing that you unfortunately heard that the disease had broken out in your dairy stock, how much a head should you think you would be a loser by?—A great deal depends on the time of the year when you have it. If I had it now, I should reckon the loss to be very great, because the cattle are in full flow of milk just now. I had it last autumn but one, but then the loss was not so great as it would have been if I had had it earlier; the weather was also colder, which helped me; but at that time I reckoned the loss at not less than 4*l.* per head on the dairy stock.

4536. Supposing that it should attack your grazing stock, your stock of beasts, say half fat now, how much a head would it take off them?—I do not think that it would take so much, but it would take a great deal off them; it would throw them back a greater or less time in their feeding, and you lose that time, which is money. But it is very difficult to give an estimate with regard to feeding stock in that way. Some have it very badly too, and others have it mildly.

4537. If you had it all round would 2*l.* per head pay you for the loss?—I should not consider that 2*l.* a head was sufficient for the loss.

4538. You are aware that there are certain restrictions now in the country in consequence of foot-and-mouth disease; do you as a farmer complain of those restrictions?—I hardly know what to say to that. We do complain of them certainly, but we should not complain of them, if, by having them kept on for a time, we could do away with their future necessity. I mean that if we did not get these diseases imported from the Continent in the future, if we could depend upon not having any foreign diseases brought to us by live stock in the future, we should be quite willing to submit to a good deal of inconvenience now in order to get rid of those that we already have. Looking thus to the future, we should be satisfied with the present.

4539. Should you like to hear that the present restrictions as to the movement of cattle affected with foot-and-mouth disease, and as to the holding of fairs in certain districts, were all removed?—Decidedly not.

4540. I understand that you and your fellow farmers would submit to even greater restrictions if you thought that there was some chance of eradicating the disease?—Yes; we would submit to almost anything for a while.

Mr. *Jacob Bright.*

4541. You have spoken a good deal in your evidence about the imported diseases, have you not?—I have.

4542. Do

Mr. *Jacob Bright*—continued.

4542. Do you assume that all cattle diseases come from abroad?—I assume that they either do or have done at some time or other.

4543. What makes you assume that?—I believe it is understood so or admitted so by the veterinary faculty.

4544. That is to say, it is not on your own knowledge, but you assume it from what you have heard?—I assume it from the investigations of other men.

4545. Are you not aware that even among the veterinary witnesses of whom you speak, there is a considerable difference of opinion, and that there is no great certainty as to whence these diseases come?—I am not aware that there is any great difference of opinion between the best authorities on that subject. I have not myself come across any such difference of opinion.

4546. Has it not been a matter of dispute as to whether the cattle plague of 1865 came to this country, or originated in this country?—I have never heard that it was doubted that it came from Germany.

4547. You have never heard that there are countries on the Continent which believe that they got it from us?—I have never heard that.

4548. Did you ever hear of a terrible cattle plague that occurred in this country 100 years ago?—Yes; I have heard that spoken of.

4549. It was a cattle plague that produced great devastation?—Yes.

4550. You are aware that there was such a cattle plague?—I have simply heard it casually spoken of. I have never seen any statistics or any particular information about it.

4551. Are you aware that that plague sprung up in the middle of England; I believe in the county of Warwickshire?—I have understood that that plague also came from the Continent.

4552. Can you tell us how it came?—No, I have no idea; and probably no one has now.

4553. If it sprung up in the middle of England, when we had no trade in cattle with the Continent, you would think it rather curious, would you not?—If it were distinctly proved to have done so I certainly should think it curious.

4554. You would think it curious that it should have come from the Continent and sprung up in the middle of England without our having any trade connection in cattle with the Continent?—It might have sprung up there as well as in any other part of England, if cattle came from the Continent.

4555. Many things are possible?—We can only speak as to possibility with regard to 100 years ago.

4556. We have some history about it?—The history about it, I believe, is very imperfect, and very obscure, and not to be depended upon.

4557. You assume absolutely that all diseases of cattle must come from abroad; did you ever hear of any disease of cattle in this country in the years just preceding the time when we admitted foreign cattle; I mean in the years 1840, 1841, and 1842?—Are you speaking now of any other diseases besides the three that I have been talking about?

4558. I am not speaking at the moment about cattle plague, but of cattle diseases, foot-and-mouth disease, and pleuro-pneumonia?—I am not aware that either of those diseases was in the country previously to 1840 or 1841.

Mr. *Jacob Bright*—continued

4559. You are not aware that they were in the country previously to our free importation of cattle?—No; from the best information that I can obtain the first case of pleuro-pneumonia occurred in Ireland about the year 1840 or 1841.

4560. You admit that?—That is from the best information I can obtain on the subject.

4561. Was not that before we imported cattle from abroad?—The disease on that occasion was introduced by some cows which came over from Holland, and it is distinctly traced to have come by them.

4562. Where did you ascertain that fact?—It is now some two years since I had occasion to ascertain it, and I forget the authorities, but I could find them out.

4563. If we had no connection whatever with the cattle trade of the Continent, would you expect this country to have complete immunity with regard to the diseases of cattle?—I could not say that with certainty. I do not know whether we have not played with an edged tool until we have got very severely cut. I am afraid that we have allowed these diseases to come from the Continent so long that they have become indigenous to the country at last. Still, I hope, they may be stamped out with proper care and sufficient restrictions; but no restrictions have hitherto been sufficient.

4564. You do not propose to shut out foreign cattle on account of foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia?—Not so much on account of those diseases as on account of cattle plague.

4565. Would you shut out foreign cattle on account of those diseases?—Yes; I think that those two diseases provide sufficient reasons for totally shutting out Continental cattle.

4566. You would shut out foreign cattle totally, even if there was no such thing as cattle plague?—Yes; I think that the other two diseases provide sufficient reason for that.

4567. Of course you would think yourself ten times more justified in shutting out cattle plague?—Very much more so, certainly.

4568. But for foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia, you would absolutely shut out foreign cattle from this country?—Yes.

4569. You would shut them out from the countries that are even freer from disease than our own; you would shut them out from a country that is absolutely free from disease?—No; if you could prove that a country was absolutely free, I would not prohibit the importation of live cattle from it.

4570. Then you would not shut out all cattle for pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease?—Yes, I would, for this very reason, that you could not prove that a country was totally free.

4571. Then you would and you would not at the same time?—No, I do not say that; or I did not intend to, at all events.

4572. Would you or would you not?—I would shut them out, decidedly, for this reason, that you could not be sure that the countries from which you would like them to come would be free from disease. At the same time, if you could distinctly prove that a given country was perfectly free from disease of all kinds, then I would

Mr. *Sheldon*.

13 June 1877.

Mr. *Sheldon.*

13 June 1877.

Mr. *Jacob Bright*—continued.

would not shut the cattle out from that country. That is my yes and no.

4573. If you had the power to do it, you would shut them out to-morrow?—Yes, I would, decidedly; not in the interests of the farmers alone, but in the interests of the general meat-consuming public.

4574. Do you know what is the proportion of meat that comes from abroad?—I do not know; it is given variously at from 5 to 10 per cent. of our consumption.

4575. If you take away 5 or 10 per cent. of any important article of consumption, it has a great effect upon the price, has it not?—I do not see that it would now, because a new trade with America has risen up, which would easily supply that want, and more.

4576. Do you know what proportion of our meat supply comes in the shape of dead meat from America?—No; I have not carried out those figures, but it would be a very easy matter to do so.

4577. Then how can you offer an opinion that the American dead meat would fill up this vacancy?—Because I know that America has resources which would enable her to send us far more than we get from the whole Continent of Europe.

4578. Still, we have had no great quantity yet. The meat of the cattle that come from abroad is vastly more in quantity than any dead meat supplied from America?—The Americans have hitherto been feeling their way in this trade, and now that they begin to feel their feet on the bottom, the trade will shortly branch out into very large proportions.

4579. Seeing that you would shut out cattle from every country in the world because of foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia, what restrictions would you adopt in this country to get rid of those diseases?—I should adopt those which are at present in force, until the diseases had vanished.

4580. But would those restrictions which are at present in force get rid of the disease?—That is more than I can say. I hope they would.

4581. Would you adopt any more?—I would try these first, and if they did not succeed, I would try something more severe.

4582. If you shut out the cattle from the different countries of the world for foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia, do you fancy that there is no portion of the population of this country that would have something rather unpleasant to say about that?—Yes, no doubt they would; they always speak unpleasantly about a thing that touches their pockets, and that they do not thoroughly understand.

4583. You think that they do not understand it?—I believe that they have not worked up the bearings of these diseases upon the meat supply of this country; they look at it purely from their own stand-point, which is a thoroughly selfish one as a rule.

4584. They look at it from the consumer's stand-point?—Yes, they are not producers, and therefore they have no sympathy with the producer's stand-point.

4585. In fact, they want to get meat at the market price of the world?—Yes, but they take just the wrong way to do it.

Mr. *Jacob Bright*—continued.

4586. That may be your view; you may be right, or they may be right?—I admit that I may be perfectly wrong, but those are my views.

4587. However, you would take strong measures, and you would for much smaller diseases than the cattle plague imperil the meat supply of this country?—I do not consider in my own mind that it would imperil it by any means, but the contrary. I cannot regard it in that light. I think it is an entirely imaginary grievance to regard it in that light.

Mr. *Torr.*

4588. Your simple idea is, that if you could stamp out the diseases which you think are imported from abroad, instead of imperilling the meat supply of this country you would make it a more permanent one?—Yes; and ultimately (and soon, I hope,) you would reduce the price of beef to the consumer.

4589. As my honourable friend put to you, there would be rather a serious gap to get over as between now and the time when your measures shall have increased the home supply?—Yes; I admit that there is a serious gap to get over, but we shall never get over it unless we try.

4590. But you meet it by saying that this new source of supply from America would cart us over that gap?—Yes; I believe it is able to do so.

4591. You have given the Committee some very valuable statistics, and probably the Committee would like to know what was your object in getting these statistics?—I have been asked by the Royal Agricultural Society to do so.

4592. It was not with the object of laying them before this Committee?—I commenced these investigations a considerable time before this Committee was thought of, or before I knew of it, at all events. They were got together solely for the Royal Agricultural Society, and it is only some two or three weeks ago at the utmost that I had it intimated that it was possible that I might have to give some evidence before this Committee.

4593. You do not think that an additional price would need to be paid in this country for the dead meat supplied from America, to ensure its permanency?—No; from the best information that I can gather on the other side, at the present prices they are prepared to send us very large quantities, and it pays them very well.

4594. It is not likely that the price in New York will rise to an extent that would diminish the export?—I do not see how it is possible to raise the prices seriously by any means.

4595. Do you think that an increased export of meat from America would tend to raise the freights on the different lines of steamers to this country?—I think it is likely that it may raise the freights a little, but the Americans are not calculating at all upon a rise of freights.

4596. A steamer can bring over a much larger amount of dead meat than she can of live meat, can she not?—Yes; a very great deal more.

4597. From America and from the Continent?—Yes.

4598. And consequently at a much cheaper rate?—Yes.

4599. What

Mr. *Dease.*

4599. What difference in the retail price of meat per lb. between New York and London?—I am not aware what the retail price is now in New York, but I think that the retail prices in New York bear no relation whatever to the wholesale prices.

4600. What is the difference between the wholesale prices in New York and London?—I do not know what the wholesale price in London now is. In Chicago, for the week ending May the 19th, choice graded steers were worth 5 dollars 40 cents. to 5 dollars 60 cents. per 100 lbs. gross weight; that amounts in net weight to 4¾ *d.* per lb.

Mr. *King-Harman.*

4601. You say that in the States there are 28,000,000 cattle, in round numbers?—Yes.

4602. Does that include Texas?—That includes Texas.

4603. You said that that would leave available 8,000,000 for slaughter?—Yes.

4604. Do you consider that that surplus arises from an accumulation of animals in consequence of their not having had a market in the States for years, and that the animals have been slaughtered for hide and tallow?—There is no accumulation since 1870 to the present time; the numbers stand about the same; they accumulated rapidly until the year 1870; since then they have been knocking the bull calves on the head a good deal in America, simply because they were worth more money dead than alive; they wanted them out of the way.

4605. Then if the idea was put abroad that the large supplies of meat coming to us arise from a surplus which is now being diminished by the exports from America, that would be an erroneous impression?—The exports from America cannot be looked upon as sensibly diminishing the stock of cattle in America. We have only had some 53,000 cattle in the way of dead meat from America, and that is a mere drop in the bucket.

4606. You stated, I think, that you considered "that the Americans would be able, after feeding themselves, to export more meat than we at present consume in England at the rate of 100 lbs. per head of the population?"—Yes.

4607. Do you consider that they can breed sufficient to keep that up?—Yes, and to double it after a time, and more than that.

4608. And in that 28,000,000 you only include the States?—Yes, the States and territories.

4609. You have not included South America, Buenos Ayres, and so on?—No, nor Canada.

4610. Have you read the evidence of Professor Brown and Professor Simonds?—No, I have not.

4611. You say that you are not aware that pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease appeared in this country when imports were prohibited, that is to say, that they appeared about 1841 or 1842?—I understand that pleuro-pneumonia appeared first in this country about the year 1840 or 1841.

4612. And you have heard that accounted for by the import into Ireland of Dutch cattle?—Yes.

Mr. *Elliot.*

4613. You say that you would undergo very grave restrictions to get rid of the disease that now exists in this country?—Indeed, I would.

Mr. *Elliot*—continued.

4614. Would you rather undergo the restrictions of the Privy Council, or of the local authority?—I do not know that I should distinguish much between them; I should not care how severe they were so long as they effected the object in view. They must be made sufficiently severe to effect that object, I think.

Mr. *Ritchie.*

4615. I understand from your evidence that you do not agree with Professor Brown in his answer to this question: "I understood you to say that if your idea of prohibiting the importation of live stock from Germany were carried out, the probability is that it would raise the price of meat?—I think there is a doubt that it would raise the price of meat; it might raise it, but I do not think that it could raise it much, and I doubt if it would raise it at all, especially after a little time.

4616. I understand you to say that absolutely, in your opinion, it would not raise the price of meat?—Eventually, I feel confident that it would not raise it, but lower it.

4617. And your reason for thinking that is, that the supply which we now receive from the Continent alive would probably come dead, in addition to the supply that would come from America?—Yes, at all events a good portion of it would come dead.

4618. I think you said that your reason for believing so was because they can send it cheaper dead than alive from the Continent?—Yes, and because they want our money too.

4619. If they can send it cheaper dead than alive from the Continent, why do they not do it?—It is a difficult matter to get out of an old habit, even if it is a bad one.

4620. Do you not think that a man's pocket very soon brings him to the knowledge of whether a habit is prejudicial or otherwise to his own interests?—If a man's pocket does not suffer very much, it very often happens that the habit is stronger than the pocket.

4621. Then your opinion is, that the reason why they do not send it dead from the Continent is, that they have got into some bad habit of sending it alive?—I do not say that the habit of sending it alive is necessarily a bad one, but I say that the habit of sending it dead would be better.

4622. Surely it is a bad habit to send it alive, if they can send it dead cheaper?—Yes, it is in that sense, no doubt.

4623. And therefore, according to you, we may put it down as being simply a prejudice or a bad habit of theirs?—An old-fashioned habit.

4624. Have you heard the evidence which we have had from the Continent upon that question?—No, I have not been here before to-day.

4625. Have you read the evidence?—I have read a little of it, but not any from the Continent.

4626. You are not aware that we have had evidence from the Continent, which goes to prove that it would be much more expensive for them to send it dead than alive?—I was not aware that you had had that evidence.

4627. You stated that one of the conditions which

Mr. *Sheldon.*

13 June 1877.

Mr. *Sheldon.*

13 June 1877.

Mr. *Ritchie*—continued.

which would enable them to send meat from the Continent cheaper dead than alive was, you imagine, that the freight was less?—Yes, decidedly.

4628. But you acknowledge that other elements enter into the question besides freight?—Yes.

4629. Ice is very necessary, I suppose?—Yes.

4630. Are you aware that in some years there is great difficulty in obtaining ice, say in Denmark?—Yes, I am.

4631. And of course if they had to go to considerable expense to obtain ice, it would add materially to the cost of sending dead meat here?—Yes; but shortly they will be able to get ice by artificial means, I hope at a sufficiently low rate, or to adopt some other process which will obviate the necessity of ice.

4632. Assuming that this difficulty in obtaining ice at low prices exists, that would materially increase the cost of sending dead meat there, would it not?—Yes; it would of course.

4633. Again, is not the offal a very important element in the question; if they had not a good market for offal over there, would not that materially increase the cost to the exporter of the dead meat?—Why could he not send the offal as well if he wanted to?

4634. Do you not think that a considerable portion of the offal would be difficult to bring and sell in good condition here?—Not more difficult than the meat itself, I think. I do not see why it should be.

4635. Did you hear the evidence which we had given by the last witness, in which he stated, although he spoke very highly of the American imported meat, that notwithstanding that it was very good, people would pay more for fresh meat?—Ah, there is the old habit you see.

4636. Some people may think that it is a very good old habit?—Of course they think it is a good one; they think everything good that they like, whether it is good or bad.

4637. If it be true as a matter of fact that the consumer is willing to give, say 1 *d.* a lb. more for fresh meat than for imported dead meat, of course that has to be taken ultimately out of the pockets of the exporters, I suppose?—I do not know; they would divide it perhaps.

4638. If a man were exporting meat it would be a matter of great consideration to him, of course, to know what price the meat would realise in the market to which he exported it?—Yes; undoubtedly that would be one of his chief considerations.

4639. And therefore, if experience showed him that he could only obtain 1 *d.* per lb, less for it at the market to which he sent it in a dead state, the loss of that 1 *d.* would be one of the additional expenses which he would incur in sending it dead?—If he thought that many people would be foolish enough to pay a fictitious price for home-killed meat, it would not alter the matter at all.

4640. Surely, if an animal brings in 1 *d.* per lb. more alive than it would bring if it were dead (it does not matter for what reason, whether it was fictitious, or whether it was a prejudice, or whatever it was), that would add very materially, would it not, to his expense in sending the meat over dead?—Yes, of course it would add that much to it.

4641. And whereas it might be a paying trade for him to send the animals alive, it might, under the circumstances that I have stated, be a losing trade for him if he sent them dead?—Yes; but in this case I think that we are conjuring up a phantom, and then getting frightened at it.

4642. That is a matter of opinion, but I put it to you as a matter of fact. Supposing it to be a fact that the dead meat is not worth so much as the live meat, that is so much against a man sending it dead?—Of course it is.

4643. If that be the case, it might pay him to send it alive, and it might not pay him to send it dead?—It might, or it might not.

4644. And you will acknowledge that is, after all, a question of paying or not paying, as to whether we shall obtain large importations?—Yes; but with regard to the exporters, it is a pure matter of pounds, shillings, and pence; I do not believe that they have any feeling of philanthropy about the matter at all.

Mr. *Murphy.*

4645. I think you stated that you made inquiries some time since as to the importation into Ireland of pleuro-pneumonia by means of Dutch cattle?—I did.

4646. How long is it since you made those inquiries?—Some two years. I was writing an article upon the subject.

4647. I take it for granted that you have notes of these inquiries, and of the results of the inquiries?—I am not sure that I have any notes, but I have the authorities and the article itself.

4648. You could produce them, of course?—I could.

4649. Do you recollect in what part of the country that importation took place?—So far as my memory carries me, the cattle were landed at Cork.

4650. Did you pursue your inquiry as to what the consequences of that importation were?—Not specially so.

4651. Did the result of your inquiry inform you that these cattle had pleuro-pneumonia when they were imported?—No, they had it when they landed or shortly after; at all events they brought it.

4652. The result of your inquiry was that they brought it?—That was the result of my inquiry.

4653. You did not inquire how long they were in the country before the symptoms showed themselves?—I am not sure whether I did or not.

4654. Then you cannot tell whether or not they imported pleuro-pneumonia; that is to say, whether they had it when they landed, or whether the lung disease which broke out amongst them was in consequence of the change of climate and the change of treatment which those cattle experienced in Ireland from what they had in their own country?—I do not know to what cause it was owing, but one is about the same as the other in gravity.

4655. Did you inquire how long it lasted, or whether it spread?—I forget now how far it spread then, but we have never been entirely free from it since; with very few exceptions, at all events. It has broken out occasionally ever since in differents parts of the country.

4656. In England?—In England and in Ireland.

4657. I am talking of the locality itself, Cork, where

Mr. *Murphy*—continued.

where you say it was landed; can you trace any affinity between the landing of cattle in Cork and the breaking out of the disease in this country and in other parts of Ireland?—I have not done so.

4658. You cannot give us any specific information upon the fact, further than that you heard that certain cattle were landed at Cork, and that pleuro-pneumonia broke out amongst them?—Yes; and that certain authorities whom I consulted at that time concurred in the opinion which I have stated.

4659. And you can produce those authorities, if necessary?—I can.

Mr. *French.*

4660. In giving the quantities of iced meat imported from America, there was a great falling off in January of this year; how do you account for that falling off?—I do not know; it is one of those curious fluctuations in commerce that you cannot account for; I think there was no special reason beyond the fact that there was a fluctuation in the market.

4661. Has foot-and-mouth disease, or anything of that kind ever been known in America at all?—I believe not; I am not aware of its ever having been known in America.

4662. You have suffered yourself from foot-and-mouth disease, amongst your cattle?—Yes, I have.

4663. Do you think that restrictions on the movement of cattle would be sufficient to stop the spread of that disease?—Yes; I believe they do stop it in the neighbourhoods where they are in force, to a great extent, at all events; they may not utterly stop it, but they have a great effect in stopping it.

4664. Have you always been able to trace the origin of foot-and-mouth disease amongst your own stock when you have got it?—No; I have not been sure that I have traced it correctly; on the last occasion that I had it I was not sure where it came from.

4665. Have you ever heard that hares and rabbits, and other animals, suffer from foot-and-mouth disease?—I am not aware of it; it is not generally accepted in my neighbourhood that they do.

4666. Have you never heard that hares get it and bring it about from one farm to another?—I have heard of their carrying the virus upon their feet, but not that they suffered from it.

4667. Do you think it possible that a hare may carry the virus from one farm to another, and thus spread the disease?—I think it is possible, but I should not like to give any decided opinion upon the subject.

4668. Supposing that to be possible, then any restriction upon the movement of cattle would not be sufficient to prevent the disease spreading to other farms?—No; but in a case like that I should restrict the movement of the hares also.

4669. How would you manage that?—I think I could manage it. The cattle are more important than the hares, I hope.

4670. It might be carried by any animal, such as dogs, or anything of that sort?—I should equally restrict the movement of dogs, I think.

4671. Then you would not allow dogs or animals of any kind to be moved about in the neighbourhood where foot-and-mouth disease

Mr. *French*—continued.

existed?—Any dogs would come on my premises at their peril.

4672. Would you propose that the restrictions should be so severe as to prevent the movement of any animals whatever?—It is difficult to say what one would do, but one would use every possible precaution against the spread of the disease; the disease itself is of far more importance to us than the precautions which we should have to take to prevent it.

4673. Do you think that it is indigenous to the country now?—I am rather inclined to think that it is; I hope not.

4674. You think it might be liable to break out again, even after we have succeeded in stamping it out?—But if we stamped it out two or three times in succession in that way, possibly it might lose its indigenous character if it has it.

Mr. *Cameron of Lochiel.*

4675. At present the people on the continent have the power of sending the cattle either dead or alive, whichever they like, of course?—Yes.

4676. And they prefer sending it alive?—They prefer it, because they are accustomed to it.

4677. I suppose that if you prohibited them from sending it alive they would then have the option of either sending it dead or of not sending it at all?—Yes.

4678. Do you think it possible that any difficulties which they at present foresee in the way of sending dead meat might in that case be overcome?—Yes, I quite believe, with the evidence of the American meat trade before us, that this difficulty would be overcome with regard to the continent.

4679. I suppose that you, as a farmer, do not much care whether they send their meat dead or alive; all you wish is, that you may not get the disease through their sending the cattle into this country?—I do not care how much cattle they send us if they send us no disease.

Mr. *Arthur Peel.*

4680. If there was no cattle plague in a foreign country would you not think that the provisions of slaughtering animals at the port at which they arrive would be a sufficient protection against pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease?—I do not know what to think about it; I daresay that it would be a more sufficient protection against pleuro-pneumonia and against foot-and-mouth disease than against cattle plague.

4681. I should like to have your opinion upon that point, if you are able to give one, because I understood you in an earlier portion of your evidence to say that you were for the total prohibition of the live-meat trade?—I do not think that it would be sufficiently safe to do it, for the men who kill the animals are so careless, as a rule; they run about the country without having taken sufficient precautions to disinfect themselves.

4682. You do not think that precautions might be taken to insure that these two diseases (I am not speaking of cattle plague) might not be spread?—Perhaps they might, but it would not be worth while to be at the trouble of taking all those precautions, instead of simply conveying the dead meat over the sea.

4683. But if the dead-meat trade was not

Mr. *Sheldon.*

13 June 1877.

Mr. *Sheldon.*

13 June 1877.

Mr. *Arthur Peel*—continued.

established I suppose you would hold very different views from what you have already stated to the Committee; you have expressed an opinion that the trade in live animals should be totally prohibited; but I suppose you have come more readily to that view in consequence of what you regard as the establishment of the dead-meat trade?—Yes, decidedly.

4684. If the dead-meat trade was proved to you not to be likely to establish itself you would not speak so positively about the prohibition of foreign cattle?—No I should not speak quite so positively at all events, because I should wonder where the supply was to come from but for that.

Mr. *Arthur Peel*—continued.

Major *Allen.*

4685. Are you aware whether they have refrigerators on the railways in America, and whether they bring all their meat from the west up to New York?—I believe that New York is principally supplied from the surrounding district.

Friday, 15*th June* 1877.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Major Allen.
Mr. Anderson.
Mr. Assheton.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Cameron of Lochiel.
Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. James Corry.
Mr. Dease.
Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.
Mr. Elliot.
Mr. W. E. Forster.
Mr. French.
Sir George Jenkinson.
Mr. King Harman.
Colonel Kingscote.
Mr. M'Lagan.
Mr. Murphy.
Sir Rainald Knightley.
Mr. Norwood.
Mr. Arthur Peel.
Sir Henry Selwin Ibbetson.
Mr. Torr.

SIR HENRY SELWIN IBBETSON, IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. JACOB WILSON, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

4686. I BELIEVE you live at Woodhorn Manor, Morpeth, Northumberland?—I do.

4687. And you are a tenant farmer in that county?—I am.

4688. Have you had the management, also, of several estates in that county?—I have.

4689. And I believe you are also the Secretary to the Northumberland Agricultural Society?—I am.

4690. Are you a member of the Council of the Royal Agricultural Society of England?—I am.

4691. And they have, I believe, deputed you to give evidence before this Committee as representing their opinions?—They have.

4692. The Committee are aware, I believe, that the Royal Agricultural Society passed a resolution some time before this Committee was appointed, which resolution was forwarded to the Privy Council, and which was the motive power that set this inquiry in motion?—They did.

4693. Have you before you the terms of that resolution?—I was the mover of it myself. It was to this effect: "That seeing that the precautions hitherto adopted for preventing the outbreaks of rinderpest and other contagious diseases of animals in Great Britain have not been successful, it is the opinion of this council that nothing short of the total prohibition of the importation of live stock from European ports will meet the exigencies of the case;" and following upon that was another motion: "That uniform and compulsory measures be enforced throughout the kingdom for the suppression of contagious diseases of cattle generally." Was that resolution passed on the first outbreak of cattle plague this year, imported by the "Castor." It was passed in the first week in March.

4694-5. That was subsequently to the cattle plague being brought into the country?—It was.

Chairman—continued.

4696. Did the Royal Agricultural Society take any further steps as the disease spread in London?—Yes; on the further outbreak at Willesden, the council of the Royal Agricultural Society considered it to be their duty to represent to the Privy Council their opinion to the effect that the authority hitherto exercised by the local authorities in Middlesex and the Home Counties, ought to be superseded by the Privy Council itself.

4697. That was in consequence of the disease spreading in the way it did in the metropolitan district?—Yes, especially the outbreaks at Willesden, when it got so far.

4698. That was from a fear on the part of the Royal Agricultural Society that, spreading rapidly as it was, it was getting very near the country districts?—Yes, and getting beyond the limits and control of the Metropolitan Police District.

4699. Was that from a fear that the local authorities might not have sufficient means at their disposal to cope with the rapid spread of the disease?—Not necessarily that they had not the power, but that they did not exercise it in a manner which seemed satisfactory.

4700. It was from the fear that, although the power existed, the local authorities were not sufficiently alarmed by the nature of the disease?—Yes, that was our impression.

4701. Looking at the resolution, which you state was moved by yourself and unanimously adopted by the council, I see that it recommends total prohibition of the importation of live stock from European ports; would you give the Committee the reasons, if you are aware of them, which led the Royal Agricultural Society to adopt so strong a resolution as total prohibition?—The reasons were, simply, that notwithstanding inspection and slaughter at the ports of debarkation, those precautions had not been sufficient to prevent the spread of cattle plague, and other

Mr. *Wilson*.

15 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

infectious diseases, in this country; and if I might be permitted to say further, I would draw the attention of the Committee to the return moved for by the honourable Member for Northallerton, which showed that, during the past three years, out of 12,380 cargoes landed, one was affected with cattle plague, 13 with pleuro-pneumonia, and 1,381 with foot-and-mouth disease. When you consider that those cargoes were the only ones detected, and that exporters are as much alive to detection as we are, it is quite possible that a certain number of diseased animals may have been kept back from cargoes or thrown overboard, and animals landed in this country in which disease could not possibly be detected. We are corroborated in that opinion by the very important evidence which was given by Professor Müller the other day, who showed that, notwithstanding the restrictive measures adopted and about to be adopted by the German Government upon the frontier of Russia, from which country, no doubt, they receive cattle plague, they will still be liable to cattle being smuggled into the country, and so escape detection; and, as they cannot detect the disease under at least three days, it is very possible that that would give time enough to allow the cattle to run through the length and breadth of Germany.

4702. But I understand you to say that this resolution was passed at a time when the council would not be aware of any fresh restrictions being contemplated by Germany?—That was so.

4703. And therefore that resolution was passed on the existing German regulations?—Yes.

4704. In consequence of the difficulty, as it appeared to the council, of detecting the introduction of cattle plague into Germany, they passed a resolution recommending that, so long as that was the case, the total importation should be stopped, as our security was so slight?—It was partly that, and also from the practical proof that, with all the precautions and inspection, cattle plague had got into the country.

4705. Are you aware of what were stated to be the proposals as to fresh restrictions likely to be adopted by the German Government?—Yes; I heard that.

4706. I think Professor Müller, who was corroborated by the Baron von Behr, stated that they proposed not only to maintain their zone, as they describe it, over which cattle would have to be driven, rendering their being smuggled across much more difficult, but that the transit of cattle should be limited to places 50 miles distant, as the Baron described it (there was some discrepancy as to the distance, but he put it down at 50 miles) from the frontier line; you are aware that that was one of the proposals?—Yes.

4707. Another proposal was, that on the first sign of an outbreak of cattle plague crossing this zone, all markets for exportation should be absolutely stopped?—Yes.

4708. And that the telegraphic communication should be made more direct instead of round about, as it is now, through a central authority?—Yes.

4709. Do you think that, if those three additional regulations had been in force, the Council of the Royal Agricultural Society would still have passed a resolution declaring the necessity of total prohibition?—I do, for this simple reason: that on cross-examination Professor Müller distinctly said that even with these increased restrictions they would still be liable to smuggling; and also, I may say, that at present it is quite clear that they have full powers and authority, and instructions to telegraph upon the least outbreak, which instructions do not seem to have been carried out upon the last outbreak in January.

4710. But that was exactly the amendment which seems to be proposed in the telegraphic arrangement by the German Government; they admit that it is faulty at present, and that we got the cattle plague partly in consequence of that mistake; but they say that they propose to correct that in future, and that instead of its being possible that delay should arise from the telegraphic message going to the central authority on a Sunday, as in this case, and not getting to us till nearly two days after the notice was given, in future the veterinary surgeon who discovers the disease at the port itself shall telegraph direct to the English Privy Council, instead of through his official superior; would not that meet the difficulty?—Yes; but since the telegraphic service is so expeditious, I cannot see any reason why two days should have elapsed without our knowing, however roundabout it had been, even if it had gone round the world.

4711. That was why I mentioned the word Sunday; it was because the office was shut on the Sunday that they represent that the delay arose?—Yes; but still it was two days before the knowledge of it reached us.

4712. I want the Committee distinctly to understand what you feel with regard to the new proposal?—I feel that it would minimise the danger.

4713. They propose now that there should be no possibility of delay in not receiving the news, but that the man who discovers it should at once himself telegraph direct to this country?—I have no doubt that Germany will do all that is in her power, but I feel that she is helpless; and I am corroborated by the evidence of Professor Müller, who said that, with all the restrictions which they may impose, they may still be liable to the introduction of the disease by smuggling.

4714. You do not think that that being the case, our protection would be sufficient from the fact of her closing her markets on discovery of the disease, and preventing export to this country, and telegraphing straight to us of the outbreak?—No, I do not think that we should be entirely safe.

4715. I understand you to express that opinion in consequence of the danger of the introduction of cattle plague?—Yes.

4716. Have you considered the question of pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease?—I have.

4717. Does that or does it not strengthen your view of the necessity of stopping the import?—I think that pleuro-pneumonia is more alarming still, inasmuch as it takes much longer to develop.

4718. Even supposing that you could be satisfied with regard to the cattle-plague, the pleuro-pneumonia danger would still more lead you, and you think would lead the Royal Agricultural Society to urge the total prohibition of the importation of live animals?—I think that in a very great measure it would.

4719. In view of the possibility of its being either

Chairman—continued.

either from reasons of political economy, or from other reasons, thought to be unwise to adopt such a suggestion as that of absolutely stopping the import of foreign cattle, have you at all thought of, or has the Royal Agricultural Society at all considered, any alternative scheme to that?—Individually I have, in conjunction with some of my friends, although I am not prepared to say that the matter has come before the council.

4720. You yourself, I understand, have thought out a possible alternative?—I have.

4721. Always retaining the other as your first recommendation?—Total prohibition being my standpoint.

4722. Under the circumstances of your being driven to another expression of opinion, would you tell the Committee what you would suggest?—I would suggest the total prohibition of cattle from all countries in which disease is known to exist, or from any country which permits the introduction and transit of animals from such diseased countries. The only relaxation or exception would be in favour of those countries which are themselves free from disease, and do not admit cattle from countries in which disease exists. These cattle should be slaughtered at the port of debarkation.

4723. Do I correctly understand you to say that, taking such a country as Denmark, which, I believe, can show a tolerably clean bill of health, you would, as your alternative, think that her cattle might be admitted into this country, provided they were slaughtered at the port of landing?—Yes.

4724. And you would consider that the cattle might be so treated from any country which could give sufficient guarantees to this country that it did not import or was not likely to import these diseases?—Yes; I should put the *onus probandi* upon the exporting country, and in the event of any disease occurring, they must then, of course, come under the total prohibition.

4725. I understand you to express it as your opinion, as an alternative to total prohibition, that all countries should be scheduled, and that some of the scheduled countries should be absolutely prohibited, on any outbreak either arising in the country or upon its being shown that they have relaxed their restrictions and have, therefore, become liable to the importation of disease?—Quite so.

4726. Would you make those regulations identical both with regard to cattle and sheep?—No; not necessarily with regard to sheep, I think. But that is a matter which comes more within the scope of the scientific witnesses. They show, I think, that sheep do not bring disease so readily as cattle. It would depend very much whether those sheep were in contact with diseased animals or not on board ship, or from a country where disease exists.

4727. Then you do not think that it would be absolutely necessary to have the same amount of restrictions with regard to the importation of sheep as with regard to the importation of cattle; would you oblige all sheep to be slaughtered at the port, or would you allow their free circulation when they came from the scheduled countries, and not from the prohibited countries?—I should not see the same danger in them as in cattle, and should not object to their removal to certain large towns for the purpose of immediate slaughter.

Chairman—continued.

4728. I suppose you would admit that a large part of our different centres of population are very much dependent upon the supply of foreign sheep?—Clearly.

4729. Therefore, inasmuch as it has been shown by scientific evidence that the danger of importing disease by sheep is nothing like that of importing it by cattle, I presume that you would be of opinion that it would not be wise to restrict the import of live sheep into this country?—I should not make it so strong a point, certainly.

4730. And while you would suggest the regulations which you have described as your alternative proposal for dealing with cattle, you think that they may be even further relaxed in dealing with sheep from foreign parts?—Yes; subject, of course, to every possible restriction, such as inspection.

4731. Subject, I suppose, to the restrictions at present existing, that if any sign of disease showed itself, the whole cargo should be slaughtered?—Clearly.

4732. You would not relax any of those conditions?—Certainly not.

4733. That is your alternative scheme; but in reference to your original scheme forbidding all import from abroad, had the Council considered the question of sheep, and were they included in that resolution?—I think the resolution applied more to cattle than to sheep, although the same danger appeared; but it was always with a view, which I strongly wish to bring before the Committee, that the future supply of this country, both internal and external, points to a dead-meat trade.

4734. And you believe that if these restrictions which you have suggested were adopted, the supply of the country would continue in the form of a dead-meat supply, instead of coming in the shape of live stock as at present?—Certainly; that would be more than an equivalent.

4735. You think that the prices that would be maintained in this country would attract a dead-meat supply?—I do.

4736. Can you give the Committee the loss which you consider the country suffered at the time of the outbreak of cattle plague in 1865 from the disease being imported?—Professor Browne is perhaps the best authority on that subject, and if it be correct, as he has stated, that it was a direct loss to this country of 5,000,000 *l.*, I venture to assert that the indirect loss was quite double that amount.

4737. By indirect loss I suppose you mean the loss to the country from the stopping of breeding and the dread of the disease which prevented men dealing in cattle as they had formerly done?—I do. It would be very difficult to compute the exact amount, but I am quite sure that I am within the mark.

4738. You think that there was a very large indirect loss beyond the direct loss suffered by the death of animals?—No doubt, and I do not hesitate to say that this country has never recovered the supply of animals lost by the disease.

4739. You mean that a fear of that disease still exists, and has prevented the re-establishment of that breeding of cattle which before went on?—That would be so, but I mean that there were more cattle in the country before

Mr. *Wilson*.

15 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

the outbreak of 1865, than there are at this moment.

4740. Have you any figures that would show that?—I believe that figures can be produced, and I expected to have had them this morning; but, in round numbers, I believe it may be taken that the home stock in this country previously to 1865, would be equal to something like seven millions; it is at least a million less at the present moment.

4741. Is that founded upon the agricultural statistics? — Yes, I believe that that Paper will be put in through the Government authorities.

4742. Have you any information which you could submit to the Committee with regard to what the price of meat at that time was, and whether it has continued at the same rate, or has risen, or otherwise?—There is no doubt that the price of meat at this moment is about 1⅜ *d.* dearer than it was in the two years previously to 1865. In 1863, the mean price of beef at Leadenhall and Newgate was 5¼ *d.*; in 1864, it was 5¼ *d.*; in 1865, the year when the disease broke out, it was 5¾ *d.*; in 1866, it was 5⅞ *d.*; in 1867, it was 5¾ *d.*; in 1868, it was 5⅝ *d.*; in 1869, it was 6⅛ *d.*; in 1870, it was 5⅝ *d.*; in 1871, it was 6½ *d.*; in 1872, it was 6⅜ *d.*; in 1873, it was 7⅜ *d.*; in 1874, it was 6½ *d.*; in 1875, it was 6¾ *d.*; and, in 1876, it was 6⅜ *d.*; and mutton, I take in proportion.

4743. May I ask where those figures are taken from?—From the Statistical Department.

4744. So that those figures are a certified authentic statement of the prices that have ruled during those years?—They are.

4745. And they show that the price has risen considerably since the outbreak in 1865?—They show that beef has never been at the same price as it was in the two years previous to the outbreak in 1865.

4746. You would give as one of the reasons for that fact, that the home supply of meat has diminished in consequence of that outbreak, and of the fear engendered by it?—I do. It never recovered the standard of 1864, not only from the great loss by cattle plague at that time, but also from the three or four outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease and cattle plague subsequently. I may point further to the fact that when there was an outbreak of cattle plague in 1872, beef was then 6⅜ *d.*

4747. That was the outbreak at Hull, was it not?—That was the outbreak at Hull. In 1873, the year following, it was 7⅜ *d.* But that was not due only to cattle plague, for in 1869, 1871, and 1872 I believe that the outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease was more severe in this country than it ever was before. Professor Simonds says that it was worse in 1842; I do not remember that.

4748. Have you had brought to your notice the statement that has been made by one or two witnesses, that in consequence of the cattle restrictions of 1865–6, foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia were practically stamped out?—We were never so free from disease as during the existence of the cattle plague restrictions of 1865 and 1866.

4749. Do you attribute the outbreak in 1869 to the removal of those restrictions?—I think we have a right to presume so. Following up my statement in 1869, 1871, and 1872, during which years the worst outbreak in my recollection occurred, I believe that we have statistical authority for stating that there were over 500,000 cattle reported to have been attacked; and it was so bad then, and the Government of that day became so frightened that they have never issued any further returns.

Chairman—continued.

4750. You say that the Government of that time were so frightened?—I have a right to presume so; I cannot imagine any other motive.

4751. Were any fresh orders issued by the Government at that time, or were any attempts made by the Government to deal with the outbreak?—Yes, the Act of 1869 was passed, which gave powers to local authorities to deal with the question.

4752. That was the date, was it not, when the Act was passed enabling local authorities to deal very strictly with those diseases?—Yes.

4753. And those powers have since been put in force by the local authorities?—By some of them; it is optional.

4754. But you think that the sign of their dread is their having ceased to make the returns of the losses?—I cannot ascribe it to any other motive; we cannot get at them.

4755. You say that power was given to the local authorities, and that that power was very unequally used?—It was.

4756. Do you wish the Committee to infer that you think that powers of that sort should be taken away from the local authorities, and given to a central authority, in order to make them uniform?—Most decidedly. I may give you an illustration of that. I speak for my own county, the county of Northumberland, in which is the borough of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, having a very large market, where 2,000 live cattle are sold every week. Immediately adjoining, within you may say a stone's throw, only separated by the River Tyne, is the county of Durham, in which there is another local authority. At Newcastle, therefore, three local authorities converge. The local authorities of Northumberland prohibited all live animals coming out of Newcastle market into that country; the local authorities of Durham permitted live animals to go into the county of Durham; so that the simple action of the butchers was to buy their cattle in Newcastle market, to take them across into Durham, and then to come back over the bridge into Northumberland, without going through Newcastle market again. I think that that is as strong an illustration as I can give you of the want of uniformity of action.

4757. You mentioned three authorities; the third was the county of Northumberland, I suppose? — The county of Northumberland, the borough of Newcastle, and the county of Durham.

4758. Have the county of Northumberland different regulations from the borough of Newcastle?—Yes; they were all on three distinct principles. I am not prepared to tell you who the actual authorities were in each case; but you will find that is so constantly throughout the country; and it opens the door to a great deal of fraud. Cattle were permitted to come into Northumberland as store cattle, but not as fat cattle; the consequence was, that if a butcher from Northumberland went into the county of Durham to buy fat beasts, he got a store-stock certificate to bring them back again.

4759. In fact, you represent that a better illustration

Chairman—continued.

illustration could not be given of the utter uselessness of continuing those powers in local authorities?—That is my point.

4760. And that, where those diseases have to be dealt with, they ought to be dealt with uniformly by some central authority?—Most distinctly so.

4761. Do you believe that the local authorities throughout the country would be prepared to submit to the appointment of inspectors by a central authority?—I should think that a great many of them would be very glad to be relieved of it.

4762. I could understand their being very glad to be relieved of it, if that implied that they were relieved of the payment; but supposing that the county had to pay inspectors, but that their appointments had to be made or certified by the central authority, do you think that there would be any resistance by the localities?—Certainly not by the ratepayers.

4763. The object that would be attained is so clear, and the results would be so advantageous, that you think they would submit to the additional exercise of the central authority?—I think so, most distinctly.

4764. You stated to the Committee just now what you considered to be proper precautions for protecting us in future against diseases of animals from abroad; that is, dealing with cattle plague, pleuro-pneumonia, and foot-and-mouth disease; have you thought, with regard to these diseases, what our home precautions ought to be, in addition to the centralisation of authority in the Privy Council, which I understand you to recommend?—Before answering that question definitely, I should like to be told what the Government intended to do with regard to the importation of cattle; because, unless certain restrictions were placed upon the importation of disease into this country, it would be utterly useless and futile to attempt internal precautions.

4765. I understood you to have submitted to the Committee two propositions: one a total prohibition of import, with certain relaxations as regards sheep; and the other a permission to schedule certain countries where no disease exists, and to slaughter their cattle at the port of landing, but prohibiting import from any country that could not give us fair security, and allowing sheep from those countries that were scheduled to circulate?—Under proper restrictions.

4766. You said that you must first know what was to be done abroad; supposing that your first suggestion were adopted, viz., absolute prohibition of import of cattle, with relaxations as to sheep, what would be your home precautions?—I consider that the country would be perfectly satisfied to adopt the system which was suggested by Professor Brown, in answer to Questions 309 and 310 of his examination-in-chief.

4767. That is, to absolutely forbid the movement of cattle in this country, and to shut up fairs and markets until you can stamp out disease?—I do not think that that was quite universal.

4768. The right honourable gentleman the Member for Bradford, in cross-examining Professor Brown, I think elicited that view?—Yes, but I particularly referred to Questions 309 and 310.

4769. Professor Brown is asked this question:

Chairman—continued.

"What measures would you suggest to prevent the introduction of this disease?" and his answer is: "I should make certain alterations in the present system of dealing with these diseases, or I should make a radical change, abandoning the present system altogether, and adopting an entirely new one in its place." Then he is asked: "What would that be?" to which he replies: "First of all, having regard to the existence of these two diseases in this country, I should feel bound to impose very severe restrictions upon the cattle plague. Both in reference to foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia; there can, I think, be no question whatever that the infective matter is chiefly conveyed through the movement of diseased and infected animals. Therefore I should be obliged to adopt such a system as would entirely prevent this movement. In order to do that, I should be compelled to divide the whole country into districts, placing each one in charge of an inspector, who would be in constant communication with the central department. Having found all the centres where either disease exists in the district, it would be absolutely essential to prevent the movement of animals from those centres during the continuance of the disease." Then you contemplate in your answer to Professor Brown's suggestion to divide England into districts, and simply to stop the movement of animals in such districts as have either of those diseases within their boundary at the particular moment?—Yes.

4770. Are you aware how many counties there are in which pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease exist at the present moment?—I have heard that there are 33; but I may be permitted to qualify that by suggesting that it is very possible that they exist very much in town dairies in those counties.

4771. You believe that the areas of infection may be very much smaller than the counties themselves?—I do.

4772. And you think that the country would be prepared to submit to the absolute stoppage of movement, and to the closing of fairs and markets, when the country was so divided into districts, in any district in which disease could be shown to exist?—I do; for this simple reason, that the more restrictive you are the shorter time is required. I assume that the animals may move under license within the cordon of the district itself, and I assume also that the Privy Council would have discretionary power probably to apply the same restrictions to the zone around the infected zone, if necessary, because the disease might be on the very edge of the zone.

4773. Wherever it could be shown that disease existed, you would give the power not only to regulate the movement within that zone or district, but, if it was necessary, to do it in any adjacent district?—Yes, on condition that it is all under the Privy Council. I wish it to be particularly understood that I think it is highly probable that the farmers of England would not submit for any length of time to very strong restrictions, if they were similar to the present restrictions, which were always exceedingly harassing, seldom satisfactory, and certainly not always effective.

4774. And your principal reason for saying that is their want of uniformity?—Certainly.

4775. Under those circumstances, the country being so divided, do you agree with Professor

Mr. *Wilson*.

15 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

Brown in what he stated as to the time which he thought it would take to stamp out the disease, viz., six years?—That is quite problematical; I cannot see why it should take so long.

4776. Do you think that the country would submit for six years to such restrictions with an object like that in view?—You must bear in mind that it does not follow that these restrictions would be in existence for six years in any one particular district; and I am strengthened in that idea by the evidence which has been given from both Denmark and Schleswig-Holstein, where it has been shown to be quite possible to stamp out foot-and-mouth disease.

4777. Doubt has been thrown upon that being a sufficient test, from the fact of the disease having been spread to such a limited extent; it has been stated that it was only in the case of a few farms in Schleswig, and on two separate farms on two distinct occasions in Denmark, that the experiment has been tried and has succeeded; but you think that it would equally apply to a country where the disease has become so naturalised as it is supposed to be in this country?—You would naturally suppose that it would; at any rate it would reduce it to a minimum.

4778. And you see no reason why, it having been successful in the small outbreaks, it should not be successful where the disease prevailed to a much larger extent?—No; it might require a little longer time, that is all.

4779. And you think that the farmers of the country would be quite willing, with the object in view, to submit to the restrictions for a lengthened period?—Yes; they would submit for any length of time, whenever it is necessary, so long as they have the satisfaction of knowing that the Government of the country is doing all that it can to keep the disease out of the country; but, without that security, I do not think that they would submit to any such restrictions.

4780. Would you suggest those home regulations with your alternative scheme, as well as with your first scheme?—Yes.

4781. In case either of those alternatives were adopted, you think that the home trade would submit to those regulations?—I do.

4782. I suppose you would imply that Ireland ought to be treated as a part of the United Kingdom with regard to this matter?—Most certainly; I look upon Ireland as part of England entirely.

4783. And therefore you think that the same system that was adopted in England should be applied to Ireland?—I do, because I believe there is no more disease in Ireland than there is in England in its natural condition.

4784. And the same conditions as to import from abroad and restrictions at home, you think, should apply generally throughout the United Kingdom?—I do.

4785. Have you yourself, as a tenant-farmer, had personal experience of pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease?—I am sorry to say that I have.

4786. Both in cattle and in sheep?—Both in cattle and in sheep; foot-and-mouth disease only in sheep.

4787. But you have had experience of those diseases on your farm?—I have.

4788. To any extent?—During my father's lifetime I very well remember his having lost,

Chairman—continued.

practically, two herds of shorthorns by pleuro-pneumonia, one of them in the outbreak in 1840 (I forget when it was exactly), and the other about 1852, I think.

4789. Would the first of those have been before the importation of foreign stock?—I do not say that it was before the importation of foreign stock, but it was probably before 1845. I cannot quite remember the date, but I do remember the 1852 outbreak; and I also remember the year before last, when I myself suffered considerably.

4790. Were both those earlier outbreaks outbreaks of pleuro-pneumonia?—Yes.

4791. Your own recent experience has been also of pleuro-pneumonia?—Yes.

4792. Was that imported from abroad, or can you give the Committee any idea of how it came to your herd?—I should like to have begun at foot-and-mouth disease, for the purpose of showing the Committee that those animals which were taken first with pleuro-pneumonia were the animals which suffered most in a previous attack of foot-and-mouth disease, by which their health had been much impaired.

4793. Your cattle had the foot-and-mouth disease first?—Yes. I sent an order to a very large dealer in Westmoreland, where I buy most of my cattle, and as much as possible from private farms, instead of at fairs. I never buy cattle in a fair, if I can avoid it. One of the conditions which I imposed upon him was, that the cattle that he had to send me should be bought direct from a healthy farm, and should not have been in a fair. Unfortunately, he had a large quantity of cattle at a fair which he could not sell, and he sent them to me without my knowing that they had been there, but telling me that they were bought well worth the money. I traced this afterwards. A very few days after their arrival foot-and-mouth disease broke out, and, instead of getting fat during that summer, they dragged their weary length along until the following spring, and I lost three months of my keep. Instead of my then being able to sell them, pleuro-pneumonia appeared amongst them, and especially amongst those which had been most severely handled by foot-and-mouth disease.

4794. That represents, then, to the consumers of the country a clear loss of nearly a year of the feeding properties of your farm?—Very much like it, because I only got three-fourths of the value at the finish.

4795. But, looking at it from the consumer's point of view, that strengthens your argument that these diseases reduce enormously the food of the people?—Yes; and not only so, but instead of my having two lots of cattle fed off in the time, I could only get one lot fed off.

4796. Did you suffer from foot-and-mouth disease with any of your dairy-stock?—Yes, but not at that particular moment, because I had isolated them in one large park that I have, and used every precaution to keep it away.

4797. With dairy-stock I suppose the loss is very severe?—Very severe. There is no saying where the end of it is, because not only do you sacrifice the breeding power of your valuable cows, but you lose your produce, you lose your time, and the consequence is that the country loses it stock.

Chairman—continued.

4798. Have you found that cows have dropped their calves afterwards?—Yes. In the first place, a great many of them did not breed any more, and, in the second place, if they did breed, they probably dropped their calves; and in many instances, some of the quarters or teats of the udder refused to give any milk. Then as to the sheep; in the same way I suffered very much from an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease among my ewes just before lambing. As you have heard from other witnesses, the result of that is very serious.

4799. These risks, in your opinion, make it absolutely necessary not only for the protection of the farming interest in the country, but for the production of the food that is supplied to the people, that steps should be taken to eradicate diseases which are attended by such risks?—They do. In the face of all this disease, people dare not go into breeding, and I may say that following up the question with regard to the outbreak of 1865, we are well aware that a great many farmers have never since pursued the same system, which up to that time they had been accustomed to pursue; they dare not do it; they prefer going to a market and buying other cattle which are probably nearer the butcher, so that in case of an outbreak they are prepared to send them off on the shortest notice, the risk being less, rather than keep valuable cows and risk the loss of the cows themselves and also of their produce.

4800. Have you any figures which show at all whether the breeding stock of the country is very much reduced?—I have no direct figures to show it, but I could quote many instances of it.

4801. In many large districts where there used to be breeders of cattle they have ceased to be so?—Yes; I have done all in my power on the estates with which I am connected to recommend tenants of arable land, if possible, to resume breeding and keep themselves out of the market; because I believe that the greatest safeguard to this country would be to breed more of our own cattle, and to keep out of the markets; but the risk of breeding is so great that farmers are obliged to minimise these risks. I have, I am glad to say, in some instances been able to carry out that principle. If I might quote an instance to the Committee, a very intelligent young farmer on an estate under my management, on my suggestion, adopted my plan two years ago; he had 41 calves which he bred and bought as small milk calves; he reared them, and this spring, at the age of one year and nine months and two years old, he has sold 40 out of the 41 that he had, at an average of 21 *l.* a piece. I myself last week sold some fat cattle in Newcastle Market; one of them was a home-bred one barely two years old, and the others were three years old; those were sold at 30 *l.* a piece, and I think the two-year old was the best.

4802. That you give as an instance of the profits that can be made on a well-protected breeding farm?—I do not say that profits can be made, but at any rate that is what can be done.

4803. At all events, you represent that with the liability to disease, at present those profits are very much reduced?—Certainly.

4804. Would you suggest any alteration in the regulations which are at present in force with regard to the treatment of these diseases in the country when there is an outbreak, we will say, first, of pleuro-pneumonia?—I am very strongly of opinion that, in an outbreak of pleuro-pneumonia, the security very much depends upon the knowledge of the individual to whom the cattle belongs. I should very much like to have heard Professor Brown examined upon this question, because I believe that he would have been able to throw a good deal of light upon it. It is a subject which I have investigated a little. Only yesterday I heard the history of a large dairy in London. Professor Brown is fully aware of the circumstances of it, but from their scientific knowledge, and by the application of the thermometer, I believe they are enabled to reduce to a nicety the symptoms of pleuro-pneumonia in the very early stage; and, therefore, to get rid of the animal from the byre, before it can contaminate the rest.

4805. That raises the question upon which I should like to have your opinion, viz., as to the compensation that ought to be given; that is to say, the inducement to the holder of cattle to declare the disease to the inspector at the earliest stage?—Nothing short of paying the full value will ever give you any protection.

4806. You think that, combined with veterinary inspection under the central authority, you should have full value paid as compensation for diseased animals that are slaughtered under authority?—I do; and I have strong reasons for thinking so. In some cases in the metropolis, I know before you could get the necessary order for slaughter, 60 hours in one case, and 48 hours in another, had elapsed.

4807. What happened in that interval?—The disease progressed so that the meat was of no further use; whereas in the first instance if an order could have been given, it might have been of some use. Therefore that was a direct loss to the country.

4808. Did the delay arise from the hesitation on the part of the owner to report the outbreak?—Not at all in this particular case; but it is a question rather of local authority *versus* central authority.

4809. With regard to the question of compensation, at the present time, a certain proportion is paid for animals slaughtered under authority; I understand you to suggest that, with a view of inducing the owner to communicate, at the earliest possible stage, with the veterinary authority, who will put that district immediately under restrictions, and therefore bring about the security which you are aiming at, compensation to the full amount should always be given?—I do, because there must be a greater temptation to fraud in the case of a man only receiving three-fourths of the value than in the case where he receives the whole value.

4810. And that delay may cause the disease to spread if the man hesitates to declare it, on account of his not getting what he thinks is the proper value?—That is so.

4811. Of course there is a danger in giving full compensation that you may have animals slaughtered as diseased animals, though they may, perhaps, not be suffering from the actual disease; it has always been said that the payment of a smaller sum, and not the full value, protected the public against that imposition; if you give the full value, you are, of course, liable to that imposition; do you think that the fact of its being a Government

Mr. *Wilson.*

15 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

a Government inspection instead of a local inspection, as it is at present, would guarantee you against it?—Assuming that Professor Brown's principle is carried out in the first instance, so that there shall be a properly qualified veterinary inspector in a district, then I should certainly require a certificate from a proper authority.

4812. You think that would guarantee you sufficiently to give full compensation?—That is my opinion.

4813. Would you extend that full compensation to all the animals slaughtered by the direction of the veterinary inspector, whether they were diseased or whether they had been in contact with diseased animals only?—I do not see that it makes the least difference to the owner whether the animal is diseased or whether it has been in contact with diseased animals, so long as he is deprived of it.

4814. I suppose you admit that the flesh of the diseased animal is unfit for any other purpose than burial, whereas those animals which have been slaughtered for the protection of the public, because they have been in contact with diseased animals, might all be available for food?—I do not admit that they are unfit for food in the early stages of pleuro-pneumonia. I believe that it will be found, as a matter of fact, that, with the exception of the lungs, all other parts are available for food.

4815. Would you approve of the carcases of all animals that were slaughtered by order of the veterinary inspector being sent to the market, provided it was at the beginning of the complaint?—Provided that the veterinary inspector thought them fit for food.

4816. And the value of those carcases would have to be deducted, of course, from the full value awarded as compensation?—Yes. I do not care whether the central authority take possession of the carcases and sell them themselves or not, so long as the owner gets the proper value.

4817. It might complicate matters with the Privy Council, might it not, if they were suddenly saddled with a large number of carcases all over the country?—Yes. It comes to the same thing in the end; but I think that the thermometer test will hereafter be very much applied and be a very great safeguard.

4818. You think, then, that the public would be properly protected, the full compensation being granted?—I do, under the certificate which I suggest.

4819. Do you think that the compensation should be, as at present, a charge upon the locality, or would you make it a charge upon the Imperial Exchequer?—I should like to see it looked upon as a large national question; I think it has a right to be considered as an Imperial payment; it seems to me most unjust that the ratepayers of the country should pay the compensation, and that the towns within those counties should contribute nothing.

4820. It is a question of local taxation?—Very much so.

4821. You would make it an Imperial question, because you say that the supply of the food of the country is really an Imperial rather than a local question?—It is.

4822. Supposing your alternative principle to be adopted, of allowing the import of the animals from scheduled countries, have you any recommendation to make with regard to the steamboats?—Yes, I consider that steamboats bringing cattle here, from whatever country they come, should be specially fitted and properly ventilated, and also that they should be licensed only to carry a certain number.

Chairman—continued.

4823. Would you allow those steamboats to carry other cargo besides the cattle, or would you separate them for that particular trade?—I think that there ought to be special boats for that purpose, and I am very much strengthened in that opinion since the outbreak at Deptford.

4824. There it was shown that the possibility of the spread of the disease arose from the fact of the ship, after having discharged its cattle, going away to other places without any restrictions?—That is so.

4825. And you believe that for the future, vessels employed in this trade ought to be devoted exclusively to it?—I think that they ought to be specially fitted up and exclusively used for that purpose.

4826. It was suggested the other day by a witness, that there would be greater possibility of securing safety if the inspector inspected the vessel before she came into the port, as the Custom House officers do; do you think that that would add to our security?—I do not think so, because the passage, from whatever country it might be, must naturally cause a very large number of those animals to be in a very fevered condition; and I think that the inspector would scarcely have a fair chance of detecting the existence of disease until they had been landed.

4827. Even where you slaughter them all at the port of debarkation, there is always the possibility of the disease developing after their landing, and whilst people are in contact with them, and thus spreading throughout the country?—No doubt.

4828. That is a risk which you think is perhaps unavoidable?—It is, perhaps, a small one. I should like to say that, to my mind, it is very important that before animals are put on board they should be allowed to get cool for a certain number of hours after coming off a railway truck.

4829. It would be one of the conditions which you would insist upon, with regard to other countries exporting cattle to us, that they should detain the cattle for a time at the port?—It would. Not only does the danger exist in the vessels themselves, but also in the lairs, both at the port of embarkation, and also at the port of debarkation.

4830. Would you support the recommendation which has been made of placing an English inspector side by side with a German inspector at a foreign port?—Certainly not.

4831. You do not think that that would give us security?—Not the least; and it would relieve the foreign country of its responsibility.

4832. It would throw upon our English inspector there, the responsibility of the cattle being healthy?—Yes.

4833. You mentioned just now that you have made yourself acquainted with town dairies; is that in London?—Yes. I must mention to the Committee that it is not a subject that I have gone into very deeply, but I have endeavoured to look into the matter with a view of seeing to what extent towns could be supplied with milk from

Chairman—continued.

from the country, so as to avoid having cows within the town itself.

4834. I suppose you agree that these dairy sheds in large towns are hot-beds of infection?—I do, indeed, I know that in the case of Newcastle, where something like a thousand cows are kept, in many cases kept in a most unhealthy condition, at a very high temperature, fed on very unnatural kinds of food, and liable to be turned out occasionally on a very much exposed common, facing the north-east, there is every possible chance of their contracting disease. Then, again, the present system of management through the local authorities is most unsatisfactory, I will give you an illustration: You may take a small byre of, say half-a-dozen cows; a man's cow is affected with pleuro-pneumonia, she is condemned and slaughtered, and he receives three-fourths of her value; he immediately goes into the market and puts a pound or two more to this money and brings another back into the very stall which the diseased cow has just left; and the disease is thus perpetuated.

4835. Do you think that there is also a danger of the disease spreading from the fact that as soon as one of the cows sickens, the cows that have been in contact with it are immediately sent into the market for sale?—I suppose to some extent, that is so. I should be very much afraid of it, although not so much so as in the case of foot-and-mouth disease and cattle plague; but pleuro-pneumonia is so insidious a disease that I should be always very much alarmed at it. I may mention that the loss which we had in 1852 was in Westmoreland; we took another farm in Northumberland, and the only cattle we took to Northumberland were two favourite shorthorn heifers; three months after we took them there pleuro-pneumonia broke out in Northumberland, a hundred miles away from our first outbreak, and no other place in the country had it. Fortunately the only cattle that died were those two heifers. That was three months after the outbreak had taken place.

4836. You mean three months after the outbreak, or three months after you supposed yourselves to be free?—Probably after we supposed ourselves to be free.

4837. So that the disease had been incubating quite three months?—Yes.

4838. Under those circumstances, do you consider it advisable, supposing that dairies are continued in towns, to make stronger regulations respecting them?—I do not think that you can ever make sufficient regulations with reference to dairies in towns. If they are permitted to remain in towns I should certainly not permit an animal to come in any more than I should permit an animal to go out when there was disease; at the present moment, an animal cannot go out of that place under the existing regulations; no animal can be removed from those premises as soon as the disease breaks out.

4839. But that does not prevent the movement as soon as the disease shows itself, and the consequent spreading of fresh centres of disease through the country?—I fancy that must be done under a certificate; but I should certainly not permit an animal to come in there until after two or three months. Two or three years ago, when I had pleuro-pneumonia, it broke out regularly once in six weeks.

4840. That implies, then, that there should be a system of inspection of those dairies under the central authority?—There ought; but I should much prefer to see the dairies removed from towns altogether.

4841. Supposing your idea of the removal of dairies from towns was carried out, have you thought at all how large towns like this could be supplied with milk?—I have, and I should recommend any member of this Committee to go and see for himself the Aylesbury Dairy, where you will see from four to five thousand gallons of milk a day brought in from 60 different farms.

4842. What distance does that milk travel?—I fancy it comes chiefly from Wiltshire and Buckinghamshire; but it is a most interesting thing to know that the success of the milk depends upon refrigeration. You can send milk any distance after it is refrigerated in the same way as you can send dead meat.

4843. The same system as we have had mentioned in evidence here, with regard to the dead-meat trade, applies to the milk trade?—It does, and it is most important, in this respect, to show how nicely it must be conducted. The refrigerating process must be applied immediately the milk comes from the cow, so as to get the animal heat out of the milk in the same way as you get the animal heat out of the beef; after which you may send it any distance you like. If you apply the refrigerating process when the milk has been allowed to cool, it has no effect whatever.

4844. Is that the system which is adopted by this company?—It is.

4845. And they send, and have sent for a very long time, this amount of milk into the London market?—It is spreading every day. I may mention that the milk is supplied from 60 farms, and each farmer is bound under a penalty to refrigerate his milk at the moment it is taken from the cow.

4846. I understand you to say that you believe it to be perfectly possible to supply large towns with milk from outside of them?—I do.

4847. And that, therefore, dairies and sheds in large towns should be forbidden?—I think so, and I support that by saying that, from the recent great International Exhibition of dairy produce at Hamburg, it has, I am sorry to say, been proved that other countries, I will not say can, but do, produce better cheese than we produce in England; and, therefore, I think we may fairly assume that, with all our increased railway facilities, and with the refrigerating process applied to the keeping of milk, we can bring you milk from any distance, say, even from Cheshire, from Derbyshire, and other dairy counties; and if it was shown to be more profitable than making cheese, as I fancy it would be, a good many of the cheese-making farms would go into the milk trade.

4848. And you think there would be no difficulty in supplying a big town like London in that way?—I do not.

4849. You describe it as one of the advantages of that system, that you would get rid of the keeping of cows in towns under conditions which are prejudicial to health?—I do.

4850. But are all the sheds where dairy cows are kept in the country exceptionally healthy?—In the case of this company, they have an engineer of their own, who goes down and takes a plan of whole of the farm-buildings, the whole of the drainage, the whole of the water supply

Mr. *Wilson.*

15 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

supply, and everything connected with it, so as to reduce any risk to a minimum.

4851. And you think that, when it is found to answer, private enterprise would produce that condition of healthiness generally in country dairies?—I do; especially when large companies like this only receive milk on those conditions. In the case of Newcastle, to corroborate what I have stated as to dairies being a great source of pleuro-pneumonia, I may, perhaps, say that 75 per cent. of the animals in those byres which die die from pleuro-pneumonia.

4852. And you believe that that large percentage of deaths from disease would be at once stopped by removing the cows from the condition in which they are in the towns?—I do.

4853. I presume that your attention has been naturally directed to this new attempt to introduce dead meat into the country from America?—Yes

4854. Have you had any experienced yourself of that importation?—I cannot say that I have, except that I have seen the meat soon after it has arrived, and I have tasted the meat; that is all my experience.

4855. As a practical and experienced man I should like to know whether, having tasted it, you agree with the other witnesses that when cold it is inferior in quality?—I have not tasted it when cold.

4856. But what you have seen of the meat had been brought over in good condition?—Excellent. It has a great advantage over much of our English meat in the fact that it has some age upon it; it is from an older animal.

4857. And therefore you agree with the witness who was examined at our last meeting, and who stated that the American meat can compete in the market fairly with the English meat?—Indeed I do.

4858. Are you able to speak with any personal knowledge of the power which this meat has of resisting the atmospheric change when it comes out from under this refrigerating process?—No, not practically.

4859. Do you agree with the statement that, if the meat is properly treated before it is sent over, it will stand in this country in hot wheather? I think it will stand much better than our own which in many cases never gets set at all.

4860. You think that the same condition applies to the meat as applies to the milk, that is to say, that the animal heat is cooled out of it, and it is able to resist the atmospheric changes better than the meat that is fresh killed?—That is the point.

4861. Have you, since you have been in the room received a telegram on this point?—I have.

4862. From whom does that telegram come?—From Mr. Tindall, a large salesman of dead meat in Newcastle, who receives his meat from Glasgow.

4863. Therefore it travels by rail after being taken out of the refrigerator?—Yes, it is sent in specially prepared railway vans.

4864. In those railway vans, is the same refrigerating process kept up?—No.

4865. Can you give the Committee the substance of that telegram?—He telegraphs me: "Notwithstanding extreme heat, my consignments of American beef have come to hand the last two weeks in much better condition than during some winter months. Quality superior, and keeping first-rate."

Chairman—continued.

4866. That you would submit to the Committee as the experience of a man who has dealt for some time in this article?—From the very commencement.

4867. Therefore that corroborates what was stated by the flesher from Glasgow the other day as to the quality and the keeping power of the consignments of American meat to Glasgow?—Yes.

4868. You believe, then, that this dead-meat trade will be one on which, when the modes of carrying it are perfected, we can rely for a supply?—I do, and I look upon it as a most valuable introduction both directly and indirectly; for I hope that it will be a means of teaching our butchers in England the real science of their trade. I venture to say that there is no business with which I may be partially acquainted that has shown so little progress and improvement during the last half century, or century, you may say, as butchering; because, whilst we have refrigerating processes applied to both milk and beer and other matters, nothing of the kind has ever been done in England as applied to meat; whereas, in America, I believe it is the general practice in all the butchers' shops. I say this by way of meeting the opinion of men who have come into this room to tell you that meat cannot be kept in this weather. Those men are evidently expressing an English opinion from an English point of view.

4869. That is to say, that the trade has never in any way attempted to bring about by artificial means a condition of temperature in the slaughter-houses which has now for some time been the practice in America, and which is attended, even in a hotter climate than our own, with perfectly successful results?—That is what I wished to express.

4870. And the advantage that this dead meat has over the meat of animals killed by butchers in this country, principally arises from that chilling process which drives out the animal heat, and does not allow it to remain in the beast which is fresh killed, as is the case in England, to deteriorate the whole carcase?—Quite so.

4871. Great stress has been laid by many witnesses before this Committee upon the necessity of having the animals in their lairs ready to kill as the meat is wanted during the hot weather; do you believe that the importation of dead meat into this country will do away with that necessity?—No, I should think certainly not. If the animal in England is to be killed, he must be what you call prepared.

4872. I do not think you quite understand my question. They have stated that it was impossible to stop the foreign import, because the butcher was dependent upon the live animal for slaughtering in hot weather; I wanted to know whether you thought that that was a condition of the trade which could be got over either by the importation of dead meat, or by the establishment of such conditions in butchers' shops as would enable them to keep the meat in a proper temperature for a longer time?—I believe it is a matter of fact, that unless an animal is properly hungered and cooled for a certain number of hours before he is killed, the meat will not keep so well.

4873. Have

Chairman—continued.

4873. Have you any experience, or will your knowledge of the facts enable you to give us any information, as to whether it would be absolutely necessary for the supply of the people that we should have the live animals for slaughter?—I think that there is no necessity for it whatever. As I have already stated, I think the whole of the circumstances point to a dead-meat trade eventually.

4874. You think, therefore, that the retail want that is described for the live animal will gradually disappear?—I do.

4875. That has very much disappeared recently, as a result of the establishment of the dead-meat market in London, has it not?—No doubt.

4876. And whereas formerly the small butcher was dependent upon the killing from day to day, he now takes his dead meat from the Central Market?—Yes.

4877. Is there any other point which you wish to state to the Committee in your examination-in-chief?—I think not.

Mr. *Assheton.*

4878. What do you think is the loss per head that a farmer would suffer with regard to his feeding-stock by getting foot-and-mouth disease established amongst them?—That would depend very much upon many contingencies. If you have a lot of bullocks weighing 60 stone, of 14 lbs. to the stone, the effect upon them would be very different from what it would be upon a lot of bullocks of 40 stone weight. It would depend very much upon the age and stage of fatness of the animal, because, as a matter of fact, an animal approaching a high degree of fatness suffers from foot-and-mouth disease very much more than a lean animal does.

4879. At how much per head should you put the loss in animals which were nearly ready to go to the butcher?—That would depend very much upon the weight of the animal.

4880. Supposing that you had a bullock which you expected to sell to the butcher to-morrow for 25 *l.*, and that it took foot-and mouth disease, and you could not sell it, how much direct loss would you incur?—Probably the direct loss would be 5 *l.*; and then the indirect loss would be the additional time and the additional food required to bring it up to the previous stage; and then I venture to say that the beef would always show the indication of the second feeding.

4881. You think that that bullock, in fact, would never be up to the 25 *l.* mark again?—I do not say that, but you would require to spend so much more money and time and food upon it.

4882. How much would you have to spend upon it to bring it up to the same mark again?—Probably three months' feed.

4883. Your farm, so far as that bullock was concerned, would produce three months' less beef in the year, would it not?—Yes, very much less; and not only that, but I should probably get a greater comparative profit by getting a greater quantity of cattle off.

4884. Do you not think that there would be a national loss to the food of the country as well as to your own pocket?—An immense loss. It is more a question for the consumer than for the producer, I think.

4885. You think that the consumer is quite as much interested as the producer in checking, if not in getting rid of, foot-and-mouth?—Yes, I think he is more so.

Mr. *Assheton*—continued.

Mr. *Torr.*

4886. Has it ever entered into your mind to make a guess at the total loss to this country by foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia since the cattle-plague of 1865; from which would you say that the loss was the greater?—I think that it has been greater from foot-and-mouth disease. I think that the country has lost more by foot-and-mouth disease, directly and indirectly, than it ever lost from cattle-plague.

4887. Since 1865, which was the date of the last great outbreak?—Yes.

4888. Would you say that foot-and-mouth disease or pleuro-pneumonia had been the cause of the greater loss?—Foot-and-mouth disease very much.

4889. When you say a loss, you mean a loss to the meat supply of the country?—Yes.

4890. You think it would be a far greater national boon to get rid of foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia than to get rid of cattle-plague?—I do, because you know exactly what to do with cattle-plague, and you can do it in a much shorter time.

4891. In making restrictions for stamping out foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia, I suppose you would adopt pretty nearly the same *modus operandi* as has been successfully employed to stamp out cattle-plague?—No, not necessarily.

4892. Supposing that pleuro-pneumonia or foot-and-mouth disease were discovered in the dairies of London, you would not necessarily extend your area of restrictions beyond London, would you?—No; and I should make this distinction, that whereas in cattle-plague you slaughter not only animals affected with disease themselves, but also animals in contact with them, in pleuro-pneumonia you would not necessarily do so, but you would simply stop movement.

4893. You gave some very interesting statistics about the supply of towns with milk; do you know sufficient of this Aylesbury Dairy Company to know whether the cattle are kept in healthier condition on these country farms than they would be if they were brought to London?—There cannot be a doubt of that, but the milk varies very much in quality and specific gravity on different farms and on different soils.

4894. Would you say that the milk so produced in the country would be a healthier food than it would be if produced in town?—I do; and, so long as the public are of that opinion, I think I have a right to consider that it is so, because the demand for the milk outside for delicate individuals would rather indicate that.

4895. Could you say that the milch-cows themselves were more cheaply kept on those farms than they could be in towns?—I should certainly think so, but I am not prepared to go into that, for I know nothing about town-keep of cows.

4896. Consequently, milk could be produced on those farms and supplied in London at a cheaper price, or at all events at as cheap a price, as an article of food, as it could be from the local dairies?—I should think so, and I should say that the demand for milk from a dairy like that is sufficient evidence to prove it.

Mr. *Wilson.*

15 June 1877.

Mr. *M'Lagan.*

4897. In addition to the great advantages which are derived from having this milk taken from dairy-farms instead of from cows kept in towns, would it not, as a sanitary measure, be a great advantage to the large towns?—Certainly.

4898. Were it nothing else but a sanitary measure, it would be an advantage to the towns that all the dairies should be removed from them?—I should think so, and I have been much surprised that the sanitary authorities of the towns have not paid more attention to the subject.

4899. You said that there had been a considerable increase in the price of meat since 1863; do you think that that increase arose simply from the short supply of meat?—I do, in a very great measure. No doubt the prosperity of the country in the interval has had something to do with it, but that would only apply to the latter portion of the period. I do not attribute it all to the outbreak of cattle-plague in 1865, but I attribute it in some measure also to two or three outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease, and the outbreak of cattle-plague in 1872, which have prevented the number of animals ever getting up to its original standard.

4900. The consumption of beef has been very much larger during the last four or five years, or from the year 1870, than it was in the previous years, has it not?—Very much larger.

4901. And therefore the increase of price may have arisen from the increased consumption as much as from the short supply of cattle?—It may.

4902. The effect of the prohibition of the importation of live-stock from abroad will be to increase the price of cattle and beef in this country, will it not?—Not necessarily so, at all; I think it will be more than met in another way.

4903. In what other way will it be met?—By the importation of dead meat.

4904. You think, then, that we are quite prepared to have a total prohibition of the importation of live-stock?—I think the country is.

4905. Do you think that we can get a quantity of dead meat imported into this country, sufficient to supply the wants of the people, without having any live-stock imported?—Considering that you only require about 7 per cent. of the whole consumption to be imported, I think you have every right to expect that you will easily do so.

4906. Supposing that no live-stock were sent into this country at the present time, but only the fresh dead-meat which we get from America, and the salted meat from elsewhere, do you think that there would not be a considerable rise in the price of beef?—I do not, because I am in possession of information to show me that there is not so much meat coming here as might have come this very week, for instance; and more could come from America, if necessary.

4907. What is the reason that they do not send more?—I presume that it is a question of demand and supply, and at this time of the year people naturally do not require so much meat.

4908. We have had it given in evidence that parts of the cargoes that have been sent here have been very much deteriorated, and have not always been fit for human food, and that they have been, in fact, seized by the local authority and condemned; do you not think that the losses that the importers have suffered from that cause may have had some effect in deterring them from

Mr. *M'Lagan*—continued.

sending more?—Not in the least, in my opinion. I am perfectly satisfied that that has not applied to many of the principal importers, and to the fixed principles on which meat is sent here, but it has applied in some measure to those who have been trying experiments to make improvements and alterations in the system of bringing meat here; and I am also perfectly satisfied of this, that the heat in America came in 15 days sooner than usual, and, as you heard the other day, came upon them quite unawares.

4909. Then you consider that the importation of dead meat can now no longer be considered an experiment, but that it is an established trade?—I am quite satisfied that it is so.

4910. And that we may look forward to its going on increasing more and more every week?—Certainly. You will probably find it coming in a more improved form year by year.

4911. If we are to have a large importation of dead meat, the natural effect will be to reduce the price of beef, and consequently the Germans and others who send in live-stock will not find it so profitable to send in live-stock; will not that be so?—That may probably be the case.

4912. Then very probably, without any prohibition whatever, the importation of live-stock will be stopped by natural causes?—I think that it is very likely to be diverted into another channel.

4913. You stated that the beef required for the public consumption in this country, in addition to what is produced here, is only about 7½ per cent.; do you refer to the whole population of the country, or only to large towns, such as London, and Newcastle, and Birmingham?—I am taking it as a basis that the quantity of cattle imported into this country in a live state is about 7½ per cent. only of the total consumption of the whole country.

4914. But the proportion that will be consumed in the large towns will be greater, I presume?—I presume that that is very much so; I have heard that it is as much as one-sixth.

4915. It is the fact, is it not, that the greater part of the beef which is at present imported into this country from America is consumed in the towns?—No doubt.

4916. Very little of it is consumed in the country, is it?—I know some instances where it is consumed in the country, but very little of it has found its way there.

4917. I should gather, from the evidence which you have given to-day, that, though you are a practical farmer, you think that we ought to encourage the importation of dead meat as much as possible?—I do.

4918. And you believe that, though the price of beef will perhaps be reduced by that importation, you, as a farmer, will be better off with a less price, because you will have more cattle to sell?—Yes; and not only that, I should be able to buy my store cattle cheaper, and to sell my fat cattle cheaper, and at a greater profit.

4919. There would be more cattle bred in the country, in fact?—Very many more.

4920. And the nation will be all the richer by having more cattle?—Very much so, indeed.

Mr. *James Corry.*

4921. I presume your opinion is that if the import of live-stock was prohibited from the Continent, a dead-meat trade would very soon arise from

Mr. *James Corry*—continued.

from the Continent?—I think they would very soon adapt themselves to the circumstance of the case. I see no reason why the same thing should not apply to the Continent as now applies to America.

4922. You think the same system that is in use in America for preserving the dead meat could be applied on the Continent as well?—I see no reason to the contrary; and the only reason that I have ever heard is that the Continental cattle themselves, taken as a whole, are of an inferior description to the American cattle, and that therefore the only way in which they can be made saleable in England is by allowing them to come here in their skins.

4923. How would you propose to fix the amount that should be paid as compensation to the owners of cattle when slaughtered under the order of the Privy Council?—That is rather a matter of detail. Carrying out Professor Brown's principle, I suppose there would be some individual appointed in each district who had a fair knowledge of the value of the animals, and who would be within reach of the veterinary inspector of the given district.

4924. In that case the value would vary, I presume, in different localities?—It would be a different individual in different localities, but there would be nothing impossible in getting men in different districts who understand equally well the value of animals.

Mr. *Dease.*

4925. I think I understood you to say that you thought the dead-meat trade would rather improve the condition of farmers in the country; that is to say, they would get store cattle cheaper if the dead meat trade were developed in the country?—I think the dead-meat trade would have the effect of encouraging the farmer to breed more cattle, and therefore that there would be more store cattle available for purchase and for feeding.

4926. If the farmer bought his store cattle cheaper in consequence, would not that affect the breeding and rearing of the young stock?—I think I have shown that a man can breed these animals, and bring them out with all the approved appliances of the present day in the shape of artificial food a year sooner than he could probably otherwise.

4927. In your opinion the lower price of stores which would be created, as you think, by the dead-meat trade, would not affect the breeding of cattle?—No; as a matter of fact I venture to assert that there was more money made among farmers when cattle were more plentiful, and when store cattle were cheaper and beef was cheaper.

4928. Did not that more affect the farmer who bought stores to graze or feed than it did the man who produced; because surely the men who produce, who get a higher price, must be better off than when they got a lower price?—No, certainly not. In my recollection you probably have now to give 4 *l.* or 5 *l.* a head more for the same animal than you had to give ten years ago.

4929. But surely the man who gets that 4 *l.* or 5 *l.* is better off?—Yes, the breeder is one of the agricultural interest, but he is only one of many.

4930. The breeder of the cattle would be a

Mr. *Dease*—continued.

loser, would he not, if his stores sell for less than they have been selling for before?—Not necessarily. I think that a great many breeders could breed a great many more cattle than they do.

4931. Have you ever known instances where stock-masters have turned out cattle suffering from foot-and-mouth disease with young cattle that were in a healthy state, put out upon the land for the purpose of feeding and fattening for the summer, for the purpose of giving those cattle foot-and-mouth disease, so as to have the disease over before they began to get fat?—I believe it has been done in Ireland.

4932. You have never heard of it over here?—I have never seen it.

Mr. *Elliot.*

4933. Do you think that these diseases have had a deterrent effect upon the breeding of cattle by farmers?—Very much so.

4934. And this would account in some way for part of the reduction in the quantity of cattle in the country since 1865, would it not?—Clearly, for the reason which I have given already.

4935. Is it the fact that at the present moment there are an extraordinary number of farms unlet?—I never knew so many, and I never knew so little capital in the agricultural interest as there is at the present moment.

4936. Do you attribute that in any way to the outbreak of these diseases?—I attribute it in some measure to the disease which has decimated the farmers' capital; and that is corroborated, I think, in a great measure by the great number of applications there are to get on to the Agricultural Benevolent Institution. In nearly every instance the application shows that the loss has been caused by some disease or other amongst the man's cattle. I hold in my hands an application from a farmer in Cheshire, in which he says that the loss of his stock by cattle-plague in 1866 was the cause of his downfall.

4937. You told the Chairman that you might be willing to relax the restrictions upon the import of sheep even from countries where disease existed; would you do so in the face of that return which you have before you, and to which you have referred?—You will find that mine was a qualified answer under certain conditions.

4938. You referred to refrigerating milk and keeping it in a refrigerated state; has it not always been considered that that part of the benefit of the milk consisted in the animal heat that was in it?—I never heard so.

4939. Is it not always considered that milk is much more valuable when it is first taken from the cow than it is when it is cold?—I am not aware of it. It is a sort of fallacy on the part of people to suppose that it is a good thing to drink the new milk; that is all.

Mr. *King Harman.*

4940. You do not think that any valuable chemical property is lost by the milk being refrigerated?—No.

4941. In speaking of the appointment of Government inspectors, you said that there would be no opposition by the ratepayers, and it struck me that you rather laid an emphasis upon the word "ratepayers"?—I did, because the Chairman was rather leading me to the point of opposition by local authorities, and I wanted to draw a distinction between the magistrates or local

Mr. *Wilson.*

15 June 1877.

Mr. *King Harman*—continued.

authorities in a county, and the ratepayers proper.

4942. You propose to adopt Professor Brown's plan of dividing the country into districts; and you say that you would treat Ireland exactly the same as England; an immense number, as we know, of young Irish cattle are brought into England to the benefit both of the seller in Ireland and of the buyer in England; how would you propose to deal with those?—I am afraid that I should not be considered a proper authority with regard to the Irish question, but from what I know, read, and hear, I should think that one-half of the fairs of Ireland ought to be stopped to begin with, for the sake of the Irish breeders themselves; because we know that the movement of animals in Ireland is a great source of disease. I believe that, naturally, there is no more disease in Ireland than there is in England.

4943. If you stopped the import of stores from Ireland into England you would cause a very serious loss both in Ireland and in the English market, would you not?—I never ventured to suggest the stoppage of the introduction of stores; they are a necessity, and we must have them; but I meant that we must do all we can to prevent disease getting into Ireland.

4944. But we say we have got the disease, and have got it very largely; Professor Brown's restrictions might possibly last for six years, and during that time it would practically amount to the restriction of Irish stores being exported into England?—I think there is great misunderstanding upon this point. I do not for one moment suppose that there is any one farm in a given district that would be restricted for six years consecutively. What Professor Brown means, I imagine, is that if his system were adopted it would require six years to clear the whole country of disease, and not to clear any one given farm.

4945. But taking a large district, A's farm might be perfectly clear, and in two or three years' time, on B's and C's farms, in that district, an outbreak might take place, and A's farm would still be restricted, I understand?—No, certainly not; the cattle might be removed under license.

4946. Do you agree with the evidence that was given by Mr. Hamilton on Wednesday, that foot-and-mouth disease is ever caused by bad treatment on board the cattle boats?—I do not quite understand what he means by bad treatment on board the cattle boats.

4947. He stated that they were over-packed and under-fed?—As far as the over-packing goes that may be so; but I have suggested that boats ought to be specially built for this purpose, properly ventilated, and duly licensed, so that not more than a proper number should be carried. It is the interest both of England and of Ireland that the cattle should be brought over free from disease, but I am afraid that the lairs both at the port of embarkation and at the port of debarkation are rather fruitful sources of disease.

4948. You suggested, did you not, that the cattle should be detained at the port of embarkation before they were put on board, so that they should not be put on board in a fevered state?—Yes; I think that that would reduce the chance of disease.

4949. An honourable Member on my right asked you a question with regard to cattle being

Mr. *King Harman*—continued.

driven together for the purpose of propagating foot-and-mouth disease; under the present restrictions, when foot-and-mouth disease is in a district, the animals are not allowed to be moved at all, I belive?—I believe not.

4950. If you had a quantity of young stores, and you had foot-and-mouth disease appearing in the fields in which they were, would you think it an imprudent thing to drive the whole lot in together, and let them all have it?—I should, because it is impossible that you can move those beasts from field to field, without contaminating fresh ground.

4951. But my suggestion was that you should put them all into one field?—You must go along a road or something before you can get them all into one field.

4952. I was supposing that fields were conterminous. I have seen men brought up and fined, because, having stores in one field and stores in an adjacent field, they had driven the healthy stores into the infected field, and kept the whole together; what would you think of that?—That might not do so much harm, if you have the disease there; in fact, it might be an advantage in one sense, that you would sooner get the other two fields purified.

4953. On the whole, would you not think it better to let a farmer manage his own stock on his own farm, and not to allow the police or the local authority to interfere with the management of his stock?—Indeed, I do not.

4954. You have spoken of the state of the knowledge that our butchers have of their trade; do you kill your own meat?—I kill my own mutton.

4955. Do you fast your beast before killing it?—Yes, certainly.

4956. I suppose you fast it for 24 hours?—Yes; or over night, or something of that sort.

4957. I think we have evidence to the effect that these American beasts before they are killed are fattened?—Yes, I think so.

4958. Do you believe that, as a rule, these foreign animals, which our English butchers insist that they must have at hand for slaughter whenever they are wanted, are fasted or prepared before they are killed?—I have no reason for knowing one way or the other.

4959. They talk about the meat not being able to be kept in this weather; is it not probable that if they do not fast their beasts properly the meat will not keep?—It is very likely.

4960. As a practical farmer, would you not rather see the prices of stock all over the country lower than they are at the present moment?—I would, uniformly.

4961. Because you would be able to buy cheaper and to sell cheaper, and your risk would be less?—Yes; I think that it would be better for every class of society.

Mr. *Murphy.*

4962. Have you given any attention to the precautions to be taken with regard to the trade at the ports of export from Ireland into England?—No, none personally.

4963. If proper examining yards were established at the ports of export, if those yards were properly paved, and close to the water side, with a constant supply of water, if the pens were disinfected every 12 hours, or every 24 hours, if an opportunity were given to the veterinary surgeon who

Mr. *Murphy*—continued.

who was there to examine the animals, the water being perpetually kept flowing, so as to enable him to examine their feet properly, and if no animal were allowed to pass out of that yard unless it were certified by the veterinary surgeon to be free from disease, do you or do you not think that, combining that with the precautions against moving cattle from farms where foot-and-mouth disease existed, if such a mode were generally adopted, it would be the best means that could be devised to prevent the importation of foot-and-mouth disease from Ireland to England?—I do not see what more you could do, except that I should object to the pavement; but that is a matter of detail. The only danger would be if you allowed fairs and markets to go on. I presume that Irish dealers are very much like English dealers, although they are probably more alive to their work, and they would have their animals privately inspected, and would take out the diseased ones, and let the others go free.

4964. I assume that the cattle that are brought in to the port of export at Cork come by train from up the country. Every head of cattle before being shipped must necessarily pass through the yard that I propose; no cattle would be allowed to be shipped from the port unless it passed through this specified yard, and was penned there for a certain time under the supervision of the examining officer; and no cattle coming from any other part of the country would be allowed to be shipped unless they went through the preliminary process of passing through this yard, and being certified as free from disease; do you not think that such precaution would prevent the importation of foot-and-mouth disease from Ireland into England?—I do not see what further precaution you could take beyond that, in conjunction with improved vessels.

4965. You think that vessels should be specially built for the purpose, properly fitted, properly ventilated, and properly disinfected, that they should be certified by the proper officers, and that these vessels alone should be allowed to convey cattle?—Yes, and that there should be inspection at the other side also; my only fear still being, as I have already stated, that you might bring your cattle from some place where they would be accumulated in great numbers, and that the diseased animals would be taken out of them first; but I think that what you suggest would minimise the risk.

4966. Are you aware of the gross number of live cattle which England imports every year from everywhere?—From 200,000 to 300,000 from the Continent.

4967. I believe that the statistics show that the number is 800,000?—I may be wrong; I do not profess to know anything about Ireland.

4968. Are you aware that 600,000 head of those cattle come from Ireland?—I should quite believe it.

4969. The trade being so very important, is it not the interest of the English farmer who buys these store cattle, and also of the exporter who sells them, that every possible precaution should be taken both at the port of embarkation and at the port of debarkation?—I think that my evidence has indicated the importance which I attach to it.

Mr. *Chamberlain.*

4970. I think I understood you to say that the stock of cattle in this country has diminished by

Mr. *Chamberlain*—continued.

a million head since 1865?—I believe that to be so.

4971. Do you attribute that to the prevalence or to the fear of disease?—I attribute it both to the fear of the disease and to the actual existence of disease of different kinds.

4972. I suppose that the land which would be used in connection with the breeding of cattle has been used instead in growing corn?—Some of it.

4973. Then, if that be so, the consumer perhaps does not lose anything, because he gets more bread if he gets less meat?—Yes, but he can get better from abroad.

4974. Perhaps he can get better meat from abroad?—I believe he can.

4975. I understand that you think that pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease have done even more injury than cattle plague?—I think that foot-and-mouth disease has.

4976. Which of the two alternative proposals which you have submitted to the Committee, do you yourself prefer?—My own desire would be that there should be a total prohibition of importation, for the simple reason, if I may explain it, that, from the evidence which I have heard in this room from Professor Müller, we can have no confidence either in the detection of the disease in Germany or in their restrictive measures on the frontier of Russia, and thus preventing cattle being smuggled into Germany.

4977. That being so, would you also desire that this prohibition of the importation of live stock should apply even if there were no cattle plague; do you think that the diseases of pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease are serious enough to justify the same restrictions as you consider necessary for dealing with cattle plague?—I think they are on the whole, although there are countries to which an exception applies which have not the disease. I may instance Denmark.

4978. Would your restriction apply also to Schleswig-Holstein, which has been proved to be practically free from disease?—I should treat Schleswig-Holstein certainly as part of Germany, because it is within my own knowledge that cattle that come into the Newcastle market from Schleswig-Holstein at certain times of the year bring more disease than any other foreign cattle.

4979. You would not treat Ireland as a foreign country?—Certainly not.

4980. Do not pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease come from Ireland?—Yes, but by carrying out Professor Brown's restrictions we should reduce that to a minimum.

4981. If you do not rely upon those restrictions in the case of other countries why should you rely upon them in the case of Ireland?—Because Ireland is under our own control and other countries are not.

4982. The evidence which has been given here tends to show that the restrictions in foreign countries are much more stringent than the restrictions in Ireland?—Still they get the disease.

4983. I understood you to say that 75 per cent. of the deaths of cattle at Newcastle-on-Tyne were owing to pleuro-pneumonia; did I correctly understand you to say that that number of deaths was caused by treatment in the byres?—It is proved by experience that the disease is perpetuated in this way: an animal which is proved to be infected with pleuro-pneumonia is immediately slaughtered, and compensation is paid to

Mr. *Wilson.*

15 June 1877.

Mr. *Chamberlain*—continued.

the extent of three-fourths of its value; the owner of the animal then goes into the market and adds 1*l.* or 2*l.* or nothing, as the case may be, to the amount which he has received as compensation and buys another, and probably an inferior animal, and brings it into the same stall on the same day, or the day after the other one has gone out, and the disease is thus perpetuated.

4984. Do you know any cases in which pleuro-pneumonia or foot-and-mouth disease originated without contagion?—My own experience has been, that I have been always able to account for it.

4985. Of course, it must have originated spontaneously somewhere or other; even if you stamped it out once, might it not have recurred owing to the conditions of treatment?—I am not prepared to admit that at all.

4986. You do not know about it?—Yes, I do a little, but I am not prepared to admit that it originates spontaneously.

4987. Of course, it must have some cause, but might not the cause be the treatment of the animal and not contagion from already existing disease?—No, but I think that the treatment might render them more susceptible of disease.

4988. The disease must have had some origin, of course?—Yes, that is what we say, and we have it from abroad. The returns, I think, show you the proportion to the number of cargoes of foot-and-mouth disease that come from abroad.

4989. I know that it frequently arises in this country in consequence of contagion imported from abroad; but might it not arise even without contagion?—I do not think so, because the railway facilities, and other facilities, are so great that it may be carried from one part of the island to the other without anyone expecting it.

4990. You say that you would rely, as compensation for the trade in live cattle which you would prevent, upon the increased importation of dead meat?—Partly so, and partly also upon the increase of cattle bred in this country.

4991. Did you hear one of the witnesses say that disease might be imported by means of dead meat?—I heard Professor Brown say that it was not very probable.

4992. You would not take any account of it?—No.

4993. You would not think it necessary to make any restrictions on that account?—When cattle plague exists in Germany, I think you are justified in prohibiting it.

4994. Is it not the case that nearly 200,000 cattle come from the Continent to England?—The Continent is a large place, whereas from Germany only about 55,000 cattle come, and the loss of those would not be very much felt.

4995. More than that number, 69,000, come from Schleswig Holstein, and those you entirely prohibit, whether alive or dead?—I should for the moment.

Chairman.

4996. That is under the condition that the cattle plague exists there?—Yes.

4997. And that is a condition which now exists under the regulations of the Privy Council?—Yes.

Mr. *Chamberlain.*

4998. Do you agree with Mr. Sheldon, who told us that dead meat could be brought more cheaply from America to this country than live cattle?—His statistics satisfied me that it might.

Mr. *Chamberlain*—continued.

4999. Do you not think that it might be left to the ordinary course of trade under those circumstances, and that if it is more profitable to send dead meat, than live cattle, they will do so?—I fancy that that is the condition of it at present.

5000. If that is so, is it necessary to impose any new regulations?—I think that it is most necessary to impose all restrictions to keep out disease. We say, bring us all the meat you can, but do not bring us disease, and if we are satisfied that your live cattle could come from all parts of the world, without bringing disease, we say let them come.

5001. But, if Mr. Sheldon is right, there is a profit of something like 4*l.* a head upon the importation of the carcase, as compared with the importation of the live cattle; might you not trust to that, without any further restrictions upon the import of cattle?—I think experience shows that we cannot trust to it.

5002. How do you send up your own meat to London?—I do not send it to London at all. My meat goes to Leeds, Wakefield, and Newcastle.

5003. How do you send it; do you send live cattle, or dead meat?—Live cattle.

5004. You are anxious to impose these stringent restrictions upon the foreign trade; would you object to submit to them yourself?—Certainly not; I have had to do it.

5005. You would not object to there being a prohibition of the transit of live cattle in England?—I have stated that I accepted Professor Brown's answer to Question 310, in which he says that he would propose to divide England into districts, and appoint a Government inspector for each district, and then restrict absolutely the movement of cattle where pleuro-pneumonia or foot-and-mouth disease broke out.

5006. But in all cases, would you be satisfied that the transit of live cattle should be prohibited, and that only a dead-meat trade should be allowed in this country?—That does not apply to the disease at all. I am prepared to submit to any restrictions, as suggested by Professor Brown, that can be imposed upon my own district, so long as these two conditions are complied with: first, that the authority shall be vested in the Privy Council; and, secondly, that we shall be satisfied that the Government of this country give us every protection from the disease at the ports.

5007. So far as foreign countries are concerned, you would prohibit the importation of live cattle even from healthy countries?—I have not said so.

5008. You say that you would prohibit it from Schleswig-Holstein, and from every other country except Ireland; you prefer the total prohibition?—Yes.

5009. Your preference is for a scheme under which the exportation of live cattle should be totally prohibited, even from healthy countries?—I am forced to that opinion from the fact that, with all the restrictions which we possess, cattle plague, and other diseases, have got into the country.

5010. Then, within your own boundaries, would you not also prefer that there should be no trade in live cattle; if you were restricted entirely

Mr. *Chamberlain*—continued.

entirely to dead meat, you would obtain greater security, would you not?—Yes; but I think we could do with less of it.

5011. If the dead-meat trade can be conducted more cheaply than the live cattle trade, would not that apply also to internal arrangements?—Yes, if it is proved to be of equal advantage to the country, and to be of equal advantage to me as a tenant farmer, I should have no objection to it.

5012. If the freight upon dead meat is less than the freight upon live cattle, would it not be cheaper and better altogether that you should be confined to the dead-meat trade entirely?—I think that we should probably be more secure; I should not object to it a bit if it was necessary.

Mr. *Norwood.*

5013. You do not appear to have seen any of the live cattle that have come from America?—I have not seen them landed, but I have seen them after they have been landed.

5014. Were they in very good condition?—They were very fine cattle.

5015. You seemed to think that the trade in live cattle from America was falling off?—I have not said so.

5016. I thought in answer to a question which was put to you by an honourable Member just now, you seemed to imply that it was falling off; are you aware of the fact that it is very largely increasing?—Very possibly it may be.

5017. And that some exceptionally fine cattle have arrived within the last week or two?—Very likely.

5018. And yet you want to see importation prohibited?—Yes, I think we are forced to that opinion; I am very sorry that it is so; but I think it is so.

5019. Are you of opinion that the country dairies are generally cleanly and well conducted?—My experience is that they are, as a rule; but you will find all sorts.

5020. With regard to the Aylesbury Company, it is a public company, I presume?—I believe it is.

5021. And it publishes its balance-sheet?—I do not know anything about its balance-sheet.

5022. Is it a commercial success?—I have every reason to believe that it is; it has doubled and nearly quadrupled its size in a very short time.

5023. Do they get an increased price for their milk over the London dairies?—I am not prepared to say that; I know that they get an increased price for their butter.

5024. You said something to the Chairman with reference to Newgate Market, as to its being the practice of the small butchers to obtain dead meat lately; has it not always been the rule that the small butchers in London bought their supply of dead meat for their customers?—I was not speaking more especially of the Newgate Market; but I believe that the tendency of recent years has been very much to reduce the number of small slaughterhouses; the small butchers do not slaughter for themselves, but prefer buying from wholesale slaughterhouses.

5025. I thought I heard some reference made to the New Central Market in London as having originated that system?—The remark was not specially intended to apply to that.

5026. The new Central Market arose, to a certain extent, owing to the removal of the Newgate Market, and the removal of the Leadenhall-street Market, did it not?—Yes, possibly.

Mr. *Norwood*—continued.

5027. You have not gone into the details of the difficulty attending the fitting up of steamers specially for the continental cattle trade, or for the American cattle trade, have you?—No.

5028. You have not considered what difficulty there would be in fitting out a ship for America, for instance, to convey a comparatively limited quantity of stock, and especially of dead meat, that would come at any one time?—I have seen sufficient to know what it does cost.

5029. Are you aware that at the present time the quantity of live cattle that a steamer from New York would bring would be a very small proportion of its total capacity?—I can quite imagine that.

5030. Supposing that a law were passed that no cargo, other than cattle, was to be carried in a vessel, would it not render the importation of live cattle an impossibility?—It would, no doubt, very much increase the cost of sending them.

5031. It would really prohibit it, would it not?—Practically so.

5032. Your suggestion about restricting the conveyance of cattle to special boats would, in fact, be another form of prohibition?—It would; but I am driven to that opinion by facts.

5033. Do you mean in the New York trade?—No; but in any trade if you bring diseased cattle over in contact with passengers, and with the crew, and with merchandise, and then land your cattle at one place, and the rest of your cargo at different places, there is a probability of your disseminating the disease throughout the length and breadth of the land.

5034. When there is a case of cattle plague on board?—Yes, and the same possibility in the case of other diseases.

5035. Would you prohibit the National Line and the Inman Line, and the Cunard Line, bringing any cattle from New York?—I think that in the case of any country where there has never been disease there might be an exception made. I was speaking more particularly with regard to the Continent; I did not refer to America when I answered the question.

Mr. *Cameron of Lochiel.*

5036. Can you tell me whether the farmers who supply this Aylesbury Dairy Company have experienced any difficulty in obtaining ice for refrigerating their milk?—None whatever, I believe; and I venture to think that the difficulties of procuring ice is one which is unnecessarily raised. I believe that ice can be artificially manufactured at about the price per ton which it costs for coals per ton.

5037. So that if the butchers of the country were to adopt your plan of refrigerating their meat as soon as it was killed, you think that the question of the supply of ice would not present any difficulty?—Not in the least.

5038. You have heard the evidence which has been given us from abroad, that in Denmark and in Germany it is anticipated that the difficulty of obtaining ice would rather operate against the exportation of dead meat; but, in your judgment, that is not a difficulty which might not be overcome?—Not in the least, because you have it in your power to make your ice artificially at the same price that coals cost you per ton.

5039. With

Mr. *Wilson.*

15 June 1877.

Mr. *Cameron of Lochiel*—continued.

5039. With regard to your second alternative, how would you propose to deal with store cattle that arrive from countries from which importation is allowed?—I should make no distinction between store and fat cattle.

5040. But I understood that the fat cattle were to be slaughtered at the port?—My experience of the cattle coming from Denmark to Newcastle at the rate of 1,000 a week is this, that they all go into the market, after the proper detention of 12 hours, and there is no difference made between store and fat cattle. If a cow is bought for a dairy, well and good; if not, she goes to the butcher.

5041. So that you would not propose to make any distinction between store and fat cattle?—Certainly not.

5042. You would not allow store cattle to be kept in quarantine in a port?—No, I think that quarantine is a hotbed of disease.

5043. Store cattle that are merely store cattle would probably not be imported at all?—No, I do not think that they would; I do not think that we want them.

5044. Have you read the report of the Committee of 1873?—No; but I have looked into it.

5045. Has your attention been called to a statement which was handed in by Mr. Duckham, who is, I believe, the editor of the "Hereford Herd Book," with reference to the estimated loss in 1872 from foot-and-mouth disease in Herefordshire, and the deduction made from that loss as to the general loss throughout the country?—I remember it at the time he gave his evidence.

5046. The total estimated loss in that year he makes out to be 19,500,000*l.* throughout Great Britain and Ireland; have the Royal Agricultural Society obtained any statistics, or endeavoured to make any calculation, of what the subsequent losses from foot-and-mouth disease have been since 1872?—No, not directly. It is rather in contemplation to follow up that subject, I think, after we have thoroughly investigated the subject which Mr. Sheldon is now engaged upon.

5047. The year 1872 was the worst year for foot-and-mouth disease, I suppose, that was ever known?—1869, 1871, and 1872 were bad years. I believe it was reported by the Government that there were 500,000 animals affected by foot-and-mouth disease in 1871.

5048. Which was the worst of the three years?—1871, I think.

5049. Subsequently in 1872 was there anything approaching to it?—It was all one outbreak.

5050. You believe that the Royal Agricultural Society will give some statistics on that point?—I believe it is a matter that they will take up; but they are not in a position at present to do it.

5051. If there is really ground for believing that in one year the total estimated loss was 19,500,000*l.* by foot-and-mouth disease alone, whereas the total value of the meat imported in that year was only 4,600,000*l.*; does not that form rather a strong argument in favour of the views which you have been expressing with regard to importation?—I think it forms a very strong argument indeed.

Mr. *French.*

5052. Have you thought of the effect of these proposed restrictions upon the importation of store cattle from Ireland?—I think it would have this effect: that we should have much greater security in the introduction of store cattle from Ireland, by endeavouring as far as possible to guard Ireland from disease from external sources.

Mr. *French*—continued.

5053. Are you aware what is the class of dealers who bring most of the store cattle to England?—I have seen a great many of them.

5054. As a rule, I believe they are men of very small capital, who go about from fair to fair and buy up the stock in Ireland, and then bring them over here?—I expect that that is the case.

5055. Do you not think that any severe restrictions would be likely to make a good many of those men bankrupt?—That is quite possible; but I can only say this much; that there is no doubt that restrictions apply more to cattle salesmen and to cattle dealers than to farmers; and I venture to assert that any complaint that has arisen, so far as regards restriction lately, or at any time, has been tenfold, more on the part of the middlemen than it has been on the part of either the consumers or the producers.

5056. I understood you to say that you would stop about half the fairs in Ireland?—I said that I thought it would be a good thing for the Irish cattle, and for Ireland itself.

5057. Then you think that there are too many fairs in the country at present?—Yes, because the Irish dealers drive the cattle from fair to fair, and we know that the movement of cattle is a great source of the spread of foot-and-mouth disease through Ireland.

5058. But would you stop these fairs at present?—Only when an outbreak occurred.

5059. Would not it be a sufficient restriction merely to stop the movement of cattle, and of fairs and markets, within the prescribed district, under the Privy Council?—I am assuming that it is all done through the Privy Council; but I believe that the present restrictions in Ireland, are carried out on a different principle from what they are in Ireland, and therefore I would rather not express any opinion with regard to the internal working of Ireland, because I know nothing about it; but it is my idea, from what I am told, that the disease has spread in Ireland in consequence of so many small fairs being held.

5060. At present I believe it is the fact, that in Ireland the management of the country with regard to these diseases is more or less carried on by the Government and not through the local authority?—It is carried on, I believe, by the Veterinary Department in Dublin, in conjunction with the police.

5061. With regard to refrigerating the English meat, do you not think that that would raise the price of meat?—I do not see it.

5062. You say that the cost of ice would be about the same as that of coal; that would be an extra expense upon the butchers, would it not?—A very small expense indeed, if you understand what the effect of a ton of ice would be.

5063. It would be a certain amount of expense, at all events?—I should think that the butcher would be more than compensated by the meat that he would save by it.

5064. Do you not think that he would make his customers pay him that expense?—It is quite possible. I fancy that the butchers do make their customers pay for most expenses.

5065. Is

Colonel *Kingscote*.

5065. Is it not the case that you may cool meat very well by means of outside blinds and other ventilating processes, without having ice?—Yes.

5066. Is it not done very largely in America and elsewhere?—I believe so; but still the main principle is getting the animal heat out of the meat first.

5067. With regard to milk, you used the word "refrigerating"; but there is no ice used by the farmers where the milk comes from; it is done by ventilation and a cooling process, is it not?—No; it is not done by putting ice in direct contact with the milk, but by placing ice-refrigerators round the whole of the cans. The farmers are bound by agreement to refrigerate their milk under a penalty.

5068. Are you aware that about Swindon and that district many farmers have given up making cheese, and that they now supply this and other companies with milk?—I am told that that is so.

5069. Do you know anything as regards the cost of bringing cattle, alive or dead, from Hamburg to London?—I have statistics to show that it is about 1*l*. 6*s*. 3*d*. per head, for live cattle.

5070 Do you know what they charge for a carcase?—About 4*s*. a quarter, or 16*s*. each carcase.

5071. Then the cost of bringing live animals would be very much more than the cost of bringing a carcase from America, would it not?—Yes. The charge of 1*l*. 6*s*. 3*d*. for each live animal from Hamburg is nearly the same as the charge for bringing a carcase from New York.

5072. Does that 1*l*. 6*s*. 3*d*. include merely the freight, or does it include the food of the animal?—It includes freight and other charges.

5073. The cattle do not require much forage, I suppose, in coming from Hamburg to London?—No; it is only a short distance.

5074. From what you know of the trade with Germany and Denmark, do you think there would be much difficulty in procuring ice for a dead-meat trade?—No difficulty at all. It is in your own hands; if you cannot get the ice naturally you can produce it artificially.

5075. As regards the restrictions for preventing foot-and-mouth disease, or any other disease in the country, do you not believe that although the original cost of the appointment of those inspectors and of the other arrangements would be great, yet in the end it would be much cheaper to the country?—I think it would be very much cheaper. I do not see that it would be very much more costly to begin with, because we have 1,800 inspectors now, and we should only require 2,000.

5076. Even if it had cost a little more, you you would not mind that if the result of the increased expense was to reduce the chance of your getting disease amongst your cattle?—We should most gladly pay it.

5077. Is not six years a very much longer time in which to get rid of these diseases than you would like to contemplate?—It is quite an assumption; I should not have thought that it would take so long a time; if you did not exterminate it in half that time, you would reduce it very considerably.

5078. I gather from you, as a farmer having a knowledge of the breeding of animals, that although you might think this dead meat coming into the country a very formidable competition,

Colonel *Kingscote*—continued.

yet you do not fear it as long as you are protected from disease?—I do not, certainly.

5079. You do not despise the formidable competition of this dead meat?—No; on the contrary I rejoice to see it.

Mr. *Arthur Peel*.

5080. When the resolution was passed at the Royal Agricultural Society prohibiting the importation of European cattle, was anything said about American cattle?—No, we did not touch upon that; my resolution pointed to European cattle.

5081. Was that because they thought the American live cattle trade insignificant?—I think, in the first place, we thought that it was not probable that it would be carried on on a large scale; and, secondly, that if it were, as there had never been any cattle plague in America, there was not the same risk.

5082. Are you aware what the quantity of live cattle imported from America now is?—No, I am not; I have only heard it.

5083. Your main position, therefore, is total prohibition of live cattle?—Speaking generally, I feel that I should be most secure with that.

5084. And yet you admit that, under some circumstances, cattle may be introduced alive, provided they be slaughtered at the port of debarkation?—Yes, so long as I have ample proof that I have every security in their own country.

5085. Would that apply to all the three diseases?—That would apply to all infectious aud contagious diseases.

5086. Therefore, as long as foot-and-mouth disease, pleuro-pneumonia, and cattle plague existed in a foreign country, you would not allow cattle from that country to be introduced alive, but you would have them slaughtered at the port of arrival?—I should prefer their not being introduced alive, but I should not see any great harm in their coming from Denmark where I was satisfied that there was a very small chance of disease. That is my alternative.

5087. You gave us some statistics which, unless I misunderstood you, tended, in your opinion, to prove the great loss that this country had sustained from the outbreak of cattle plague of 1865, and you said that there were less cattle in the country now than there were previously to 1865?—I believe that there are a million less.

5088. If you will kindly look at the figures which you gave us of the price of meat during that time, you will see that it is not a continuous increase?—No, not quite.

5089. Can you explain the fluctuations, because I notice that in some of the years, even since 1865, the price diminishes?—You will observe that, in the two years previously to 1865, the mean price of meat was 5¼*d*.; if you look at the other figures, you will find that it never came down to that standard again.

5090. But it got to 5¾*d*.?—It did, in 1867, when beef varied from 4¼*d*. to 6¾*d*.

5091. What was the reason of the drop there?—It might probably be that at that time that the demand was not so great, or something of that kind; the trade of the country might not be so good.

5092. Do you not think that there were other reasons to account for the increased price besides the cattle plague of 1865?—Certainly; but there were other outbreaks of cattle plague, which diminished

Mr. *Wilson.*

15 June 1877.

Mr. *Arthur Peel*—continued.

minished the food of the country, and then there is also the prosperity of the country in recent years. In my own experience, in a large county where there a great many collieries, the labouring class have learnt to eat beef, and they have not forgotten it.

5093. Are you aware what was the foreign importation of meat during the period from 1865 to the present time?—In 1872, about 5 per cent. was the importation of live stock, but I am not prepared to show the quantities.

5094. It is important that we should have that before we can form a conclusion, is it not?—Yes; but I think the price very much indicates the quantity.

5095. You said, I think, that the reason why there were no foot-and-mouth returns was because the Government were so frightened at the dimensions of the disease that they had refused to ask for any returns; are you aware that the farmers themselves were asked to make returns of foot-and-mouth disease, and that they objected in consequence of the great expense and of the inutility of the returns?—It may have been partially so, but some would make a return; the farmers do make returns.

5096. But if some made a return and others do not the value of it would be destroyed?—Then it may probably diminish the value of the present statistics altogether.

5097. Are you aware that in January 1876 the Privy Council asked farmers not officially, but privately, if I may so say, for returns of foot-and-mouth disease, and do you know whether any returns are furnished by farmers in your part of the country as to foot-and-mouth disease?—No doubt our local authorities have those returns, but what use they may have made of them I cannot tell you.

Major *Allen.*

5098. I suppose that the police have all the information about the number of animals that have been attacked, and the number of animals that have died from pleuro-pneumonia?—Yes, the local authority would know the number.

5099. You were not examined before the Committee of 1873, were you?—No.

5100. That Committee, in their report, say with respect to foot-and-mouth disease, "Your Committee have come to the conclusion that it is hopeless to attempt to extirpate, or even materially to check, this disease, unless the above-mentioned stringent measures are strictly enforced; and they also believe that such enforcement would require a costly and numerous staff of inspectors, an amount of supervision by the central authority which would excite much local opposition, at any rate in Great Britain, and such an interference with the home trade in animals as would much affect prices, and would induce not only the consumer but the producer to consider the remedy to be worse than the disease." Do you agree with that?—I think that there has been a very great change of feeling amongst the agricultural interest of the country since that time.

5101. What you want particularly is uniformity of action?—That is all we ask for.

5102. And you want the Privy Council to manage all these affairs, because they would appoint inspectors far better fitted for the work?—Yes.

Chairman.

5103. I should like to be quite clear with regard to your views as to the question of dealing with the Irish cattle; I understand you to say that you wish absolutely the same regulations to be adopted in Ireland as are adopted in other parts of the United Kingdom?—I refer more to the external treatment, you may say, of Ireland at the ports. Within Ireland, I am not quite clear as to how it works at present, because I know it is different from our action in England.

5104. Your object in England seems to be to bring about uniformity?—Yes.

5105. And you answered me, I think, that in Ireland the same regulations with regard to foot-and-mouth disease should exist as exist in England; that implies dividing Ireland into districts and appointing government inspectors, and stopping the movement of cattle within districts where the disease arose?—I should think that that would be the best plan, although there may be something connected with Ireland of which I am ignorant.

5106. If that was adopted the Irish stores would come freely into this country as they do now, from all districts that were not under restriction?—I think they would come more freely.

5107. And by degrees, stamping out the disease, as you hope to do by these restrictions, there would be perfect freedom for those animals?—Clearly; that is my object.

5108. An honourable Member has asked you with regard to this resolution that you moved as to the stoppage of imports, and its application to the American live cattle trade; I understand that that resolution applied entirely to European cattle, and that this question of American cattle was not contemplated by the society at all?—No, never; that is why the resolution specially applied to European cattle.

5109. At the same time should such a restriction as to the absolute prohibition of the import of live animals be enforced, it would apply to the American trade?—Yes, although I do not quite see the same reason for it.

5110. Therefore, do you not think that that is an additional reason for your alternative scheme?—I do.

5111. And American cattle would therefore be treated the same as Denmark cattle, or as cattle from one of the scheduled countries?—Yes; and I must go further than that, and say, that from a country like America, which has never known disease, and where there has been only one case probably of foot-and-mouth disease imported from England, I think that there would be very little harm, under certain conditions, in allowing cattle to come into England and remain, especially for breeding purposes.

5112. You think that even further relaxations might be made with regard to America?—I do.

5113. Have you had your attention called to the evidence that has been given before this Committee as to Texan fever, which is almost as bad in its effects as cattle-plague?—Yes; Professor Brown, I think, mentioned it to you.

5114. And that does not alter your opinion as to the freedom to be granted to American cattle?—It would be done, of course, under certain restrictions; I should require to be perfectly satisfied first that they were clear from disease; and Professor Brown said that Texan fever, I think,

Chairman—continued.

was not likely to exist or continue in this country.

5115. I suppose you think that the length of the voyage gives you additional security in the case of American cattle?—It does.

5116. With regard to the restrictions which you suggest for dealing with pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease in this country, and the way in which they affect the question with regard to the foreign import, I think I understood you to say that the proposals which you suggest with reference to foreign cattle are suggested with a view of working together, with your home restrictions, for the absolute abolition of these diseases?—Yes; it must be done conjointly, or not at all.

5117. And you are obliged to take more stringent measures with regard to foreigners than you are with regard to the home trade, in consequence of the difficulty of dealing with foreigners, over whom you have no control?—That is so.

5118. I think you stated that you would absolutely stop the importation of store cattle into this country from European ports?—Yes, I believe it to be a necessity.

5119. You believe that store cattle for English farming purposes are not required?—I do.

5120. Has you attention been called, in connection with the dairy part of the store-cattle question, to the fact that we are in a large measure dependent in some of our town dairies upon the Dutch cows?—I am told that we are to a small extent.

5121. There is a large importation of Dutch cows in consequence of their wonderful milking power?—There is no great number. I have heard that it is 20,000 per annum, but I do not know whether that is correct.

5122. And you think that for dairy purposes that number might be done without?—Very easily, for the reason which I gave you a while ago, viz., that I think that it will be found to be more profitable to produce milk than to produce cheese at home.

5123. And, therefore, a very much larger field of milk supply would be opened up in the country as soon as the want in the towns was felt?—Yes.

Chairman—continued.

5124. You stated, in answer to an honourable Member, that you thought, though a reduction would take place in the price of your stock from this importation of dead meat, it would rather benefit you?—Certainly.

5125. Applying that to the very small cottier farmers, of whom there are a large number in Ireland, who have one or two or three cows, and who sell the produce as yearlings, would not the reduction in price affect them more seriously?—I do not see why it should. As I have already stated, a great many of them can produce more, if they want to do so.

5126. But would these small men with very small occupations be able to produce a sufficient increase of stock to cover the reduced price?—I could not say how it would affect the cottiers, because I do not know anything about them in Ireland. I am speaking as a large farmer; I take the whole question as a large question.

5127. You refer to the large farms with which you are acquainted, and in which you believe that the greater amount of stock that you would be able to produce would cover the reduction of price?—Yes; it is impossible to make any great alteration in a system without interfering in some degree with some individual interest.

5128. At the same time, that question does arise with regard to Ireland, because it is a general state of things in that country?—I believe that the agriculturists in Ireland are of a very small class, with small holdings, therefore the loss of a cow or calf from disease would be a very serious matter.

5129. I think that you are able to answer a question which was asked of another witness, with regard to the number of counties in the country where the present regulations have been adopted by the local authority?—There are 36 counties and 29 boroughs in which there are restrictions with regard to cattle-plague.

Mr. HERRMAN GEBHARDT, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

5130. I BELIEVE you have been now for many years interested in the importation of foreign cattle into this country?—I have.

5131. I think you were one of the original importers?—I believe that I was one of the first.

5132. And as such you have naturally had very great experience of the trade in foreign animals?—I have.

5133. You were examined, I think, at considerable length before the Committee of 1873?—Yes, and in 1868 as well.

5134. And you gave a considerable amount of information to those Committees on this very point?—I did.

5135. Your attention has been naturally directed, I presume, to the recent outbreak of cattle-plague in Hamburg?—Yes.

5136. That outbreak spread to this country, as we know, by the introduction of animals through the ship "Castor"?—Yes.

5137. Do you think that the information which we received was sufficient, or that the system under which we received information from that country, in this instance, was satisfactory?—I think it was not satisfactory.

Chairman—continued.

5138. Do you think it would be possible to amend it?—I think it would.

5139. From your practical knowledge of the working of this trade, how would you suggest that we might strengthen our hands by foreign information?—I believe that the information might have been here 24 hours before we received it. It appears that the outbreak of cattle-plague in Hamburg was known officially on the Sunday morning.

5140. That was the day on which it has been stated in evidence before this Committee that the telegram went to the central authority in Schleswig, and lay there during Sunday?—Yes.

5141. You would, then, confirm the suggestion that has been made by the witness from the German Government, that that information might have been more readily given to the Privy Council here,

Mr. *Gebhardt.*

15 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

here, if the new rule which they suggest had been in force, of making the inspector, where the disease is detected, telegraph direct instead of through a central office?—I certainly think that that ought to be done.

5142. You think that that would have given us, in this instance, such security as would probably have enabled us to take better precautions on the arrival of the "Castor"?—I believe that if that security had been given the "Castor" would not have been allowed to land her cattle, because we should have received the information 24 hours before the steamer arrived.

5143. Do you think that what was done was satisfactory, as soon as it was known, and the cattle arrived at Deptford?—No, I do not, because I think there was too much delay before the cattle were killed, and actually afterwards destroyed.

5144. It was stated by another witness that some time elapsed after it was discovered that it was cattle-plague before they actually killed the animals?—I believe that that was so.

5145. How would you strengthen the regulations, so as to deal with the omissions which you think occurred then?—I first of all would say, that there ought to be an understanding with foreign Governments that the moment cattle-plague appears this country should be informed of it; but as we only deal with one country where cattle-plague appears, viz., Germany, and as they do not keep it a secret when it exists there, there would not be the slightest difficulty in our having the same information. If cattle-plague breaks out in Prussia, the law is enforced instantly, and it is published at the places where cattle-plague appears; in fact, no cattle are allowed to come out from the place. As we can get no cattle from Germany, on an average, under 48 hours, we should always know long before the vessel arrived that they had the cattle-plague; and if any steamer were on the route, we could stop her landing.

5146. Then you think that proper telegraphic information might be relied upon to stop the landing of diseased animals?—I believe so.

5147. And that the reason why we had not been able in this case to prevent the introduction of cattle-plague was principally the imperfect information, which you believe is not necessarily imperfect?—Just so.

5148. Has your attention been directed to the evidence that has been given by Professor Müller and by the Baron von Behr as to the further restrictions which they propose to adopt in Germany in consequence of this outbreak?—It has.

5149. Are you of opinion that those restrictions will strengthen our protection against the importation of disease?—Yes; I think they must do so very much indeed; because I fancy that if they carry out what they propose, cattle plague could never escape out of the country.

5150. You mean that the restrictions which they suggest would absolutely protect us against cattle-plague, even if it arose in that country?—Yes.

5151. I suppose that Germany, as a country, has herself the greatest possible interest in preventing the introduction of disease into her herds?—Yes, of course they have, because they not only have to protect their cattle, as we do, for meat purposes, but they use them for agricultural purposes; they do all their ploughing by oxen.

Chairman—continued.

5152. Through a large portion of Prussia they are absolutely dependent upon their oxen for the tillage of the land?—That is so.

5153. Therefore, whilst we have the inducement in this country of protecting our meat supply, they have the additional inducement, of course, of protecting the means by which they till the land?—That is so.

5154. Therefore Germany is naturally anxious to bring about any regulations which would give her security, independently of her wish to continue a trade with this country?—Yes, and they have much more severe power than we have in this country.

5155. Being more despotic in their government, they are able to use stronger powers and greater restrictions with regard to these diseases?—I believe that in Germany a great deal of the law is all in one hand in this matter; while here it appears to me that with the local authorities it is one authority against the other, which I think in such a case should be entirely abolished, and it should be one law of the land.

5156. You agree with the last witness that the power of the local authority should be done away with, and that the Privy Council should take the complete control of the regulation of these diseases in the country?—I believe that in the case of cattle-plague there should be no doubt about it.

5157. Do you separate the question of foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia from the question of cattle-plague as to the regulations that should be applied?—Entirely.

5158. I understand you to say that you are of opinion that for the purpose of dealing with cattle plague the powers at present existing in this country under the Act should be transferred to the central authority?—I believe that that would be the best way.

5159. You are aware of the mode in which it is dealt with by the Privy Council here at the present moment?—I think I know most of the rules and regulations.

5160. You know that the Privy Council have the power of taking upon themselves at any time they please this restrictive authority?—Yes.

5161. And you suggest that the present Act should be repealed, and that that Order of Council, enabling them to do it when diseases arose, if they thought it necessary, should be made compulsory and general?—Yes.

5162. To go back to the landing of animals at Deptford; in case disease breaks out, is there anything which you would suggest as a greater security for our protection in this country beyond your recommendation that the animals should be more quickly slaughtered?—I believe that the way in which these cattle were treated was as bad as could be, because they were allowed to remain a day or two before they were killed; I believe the last were killed on the Thursday, and the remaining part of the bodies were not destroyed or boiled down until the following Wednesday. I do not believe there were 40 left at the time; some died on landing; but they actually took very nearly a week before they were boiled down; they were laid at Deptford, and only some lime was sprinkled over them.

5163. The process which is adopted there is not

Chairman—continued.

not to bury them, but to boil them down?—Yes, and they said there was not sufficient accommodation to do it, and consequently these cattle were left lying about dead for six or seven days.

5164. You would then suggest that the burying of the body should be made absolutely compulsory instead of the system of boiling down?—Yes, that is the mode which is adopted in Germany, because then you can destroy a great number of cattle at once, but if you boil them down it is a slow process, and you can only destroy a certain number in a day.

5165. And you think that the German system of digging a large trench and burying them at once gets rid of the possibility of contagion?—Yes, they not only destroy the bodies at once, but they pull the building down and burn it. In Hamburg, they burnt the whole cattle market, every stick of it, this last time.

5166. That shows not only that they have greater powers, but very much stronger restrictions in Germany than we have in this country?—Yes, and a quicker cure.

5167. I suppose you admit, as another witness did, that the Privy Council adopted every regulation that they had power to adopt under the circumstances to protect the town, that, although they were a long time in consequence of their machinery not being sufficient in getting rid of the animals, the place was declared an infected place, and all egress from it and ingress to it were stopped?—Yes.

5168. And, therefore, everything was done by the Privy Council, supposing the boiling process to be the one they sanctioned, which could be done under the circumstances?—I believe that so far as the Privy Council was concerned it did do so; but the city authorities would not allow the other boiling-houses to be used. I am only speaking now from hearsay; there are three or four boiling-houses, and they did not use them.

5169. You know, as a fact, that there being on the spot three or four boiling-down houses, only one was used?—Only one boiling-house was used.

5170. And the process, in consequence, was so slow that it took from Thursday to the following Wednesday, before all the bodies were disposed of?—That is so.

5171. And you represent that that is one danger which we might get over by adopting regulations more in accordance with those which are adopted in Germany?—I do.

5172. With regard to foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia, we have had a great deal of evidence given to us, the object of which is to attempt in this country to stamp out those diseases; have you, from your long experience of the trade, and from your knowledge of these diseases, formed any opinion upon that possibility?—In my opinion, it is impossible to stamp them out.

5173. Can you give the Committee any reason to strengthen that opinion?—I can only repeat my former evidence. I used to breed cattle and graze cattle in this country; foot-and-mouth disease broke out on my farm without my being able to give any reason or cause for it; and I have had young bulls which I reared, pedigree stock, taken with lung disease, and I could give no reason for it, because I had introduced no other stock among them.

Chairman—continued.

5174. Was there any outbreak of these diseases at the time in your neighbourhood?—I will not say that there was not any in my neighbourhood, but certainly not within some miles, because people in my neighbourhood did not keep cattle; most of the land adjoining my farm is used for haymaking.

5175. It was grass land round you?—Yes.

5176. Did you satisfy yourself that it could not have been introduced in the way that people have suggested that it is possible to carry foot and-mouth disease by dogs, or hares, or rabbits, or other animals coming across from the ground that was in infected into your own pasture?—I could not prove that that was the case, and I have no reason to believe that it was so.

5177. The impression that was left on your own mind was that these outbreaks were spontaneous rather than that they were produced by contact?—That has always been my impression.

5178. I suppose you would use that argument to show that even if you succeeded for a time in stamping out foot-and-mouth disease, yet under the conditions of this climate it would always break out again?—I believe it would. I have a statement here in the "Field" of this very week with regard to the outbreak of pleuro-pneumonia in Cornwall, which is stated to be believed to have come from Ireland.

5179. Is that a newspaper extract?—Yes, it is from the "Field" of the 9th June 1877.

5180. Is this statement signed by anybody?—No it is merely announced that pleuro-pneumonia has appeared in several places in Cornwall.

Sir *George Jenkinson.*

5181. It is at a place called Helstone, in Cornwall, is it not?—It is.

Chairman.

5182. With regard to pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease I understand you to say that you believe that no restrictions which we could put upon the home trade would stamp them out; and I suppose you would infer that it would be useless for us to place any additional restrictions and regulations upon foreign import on account of these diseases?—Certainly.

5183. In addition to the fact that we have it in our own country, we have very strong regulations at present as against the introduction of the disease from abroad?—Yes, they are not allowed to leave the place alive.

5184. That applies also to the whole cargo that comes over, even though it is supposed to be sound?—Yes; if one single animal is declared by the inspector to have either pleuro-pneumonia, foot-and-mouth disease, sheep-scab, or any disease the whole cargo is slaughtered at the place of landing.

5185. On that you formed your idea that our regulations, strengthened as you suggest they might be, by telegraphic communication, and the stricter regulation to be adopted abroad, are sufficient for our protection as against the foreign import, without taking the measure of stopping that trade?—That is my opinion.

5186. Have you considered this American meat question which has been introduced to this Committee?—Yes, I have heard a good deal of the evidence.

5187. You have examined, I suppose, the history of the introduction of this meat?—Yes.

Mr. *Gebhardt.*

25 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

5188. What opinion have you formed with regard to the statements that you have heard about it?—I have heard various statements, and I think it is a very difficult matter to give a clear opinion about; I have seen American meat, and certainly some of it arrives in very good condition, and is of excellent quality, there can be no doubt about that; but I have seen other meat in a very bad state, and in fact not fit for human food, which would not be allowed to be sold in a public market, in the Metropolitan Meat Market, for instance; but which is taken outside to some shops where I believe the city authorities have no power to seize it, and that has been sold, as I have seen myself, as at low as 1 *s.* a stone or 1½ *d.* a pound. This was good meat, but in a nasty smelling state, and when I asked the butcher what could be done with this meat, "Oh," he said, "it all goes in sausages."

5189. Have you had it brought to your knowledge whether, what a witness stated to us was the case, viz., that with regard to much of that meat which is selling cheaply, after trimming it a considerable portion of it is very sound and good still?—If you cut all the outside off, which, of course, looked a black and nasty colour and has a nasty smell; I should very likely believe, and in fact I know, that a lot of this meat is consumed, and is bought by the butchers at a great deal less money than other meat; but still it leaves an enormous profit to the man who sells it. A great many people buy it, and do not know what they buy, because when a man goes and buys meat for 1½ *d.* per lb. of course he can sell it at almost any price to get a profit; but a lot of it is seized as being unfit for human food.

5190. That I understand to have amounted to a considerable quantity in the last fortnight?—Three great waggon loads of American meat have gone down this morning to Deptford to be boiled down, and the smell when they boil it down is so bad that it almost drives us out of the market. That has been lately an every day occurrence.

5191. I think you were in the room when a witness gave evidence that the reason why this bad meat was in the London market was, that it was meat which had not been sold in Liverpool which had been sent to London, and which had not arrived in this country in as good a condition as it ought to have done from the failure of their material, or from their attempt to pack it too closely; has that been brought to your notice?—It appears to me that whenever they have small consignments in a steamer the meat comes in fair condition. I have not seen the process on the steamer myself; I am only stating what is my opinion. When they send larger lots in one steamer then a great deal of this meat comes in bad condition; and I myself fancy that it is because there is not sufficient room for the ice, or because the cold air cannot get to it, that part of it arrives in bad condition and part arrives in good condition. I think that the greater part of the bad meat has arrived not in the hot weather, but before it was very hot.

5192. I suppose you would admit that a large proportion of it in the country (perhaps not so much of it in London) has arrived in very good condition?—Yes, I believe so.

5193. That being the case, would not the very fact of that loss tend to induce the sender to increase his care, so as to send it all over in a condition that would pay?—Yes, I believe he will do so; but then, of course, the expense will be greater, because if he puts a certain lot of meat in a certain space, and he can double the quantity in that certain space, it costs so much less money, because I believe they go by measurement.

Chairman—continued.

5194. The importer of it stated here that a cargo coming over in good condition and selling at 6 *d.* or 6½ *d.* per lb. paid?—So I understand.

5195. Under these circumstances, after they have tried all their experiments, and found that they lose by those experiments, would not the result be that it would settle down into a fixed trade, by which we should secure the meat in the best condition, and they would get their 6 *d.* per pound, which they say pays them?—If the meat pays here at 6 *d.* per pound, and they can bring it over without additional expense, it might answer their purpose; but supposing that the expense was larger, then it might be a question as to whether it would pay. I am not for a moment saying that they cannot bring the American meat over in good condition, because if they bring it over sometimes in good condition they can bring it always in good condition.

5196. Therefore naturally it may be supposed that these experiments will result in their adopting a system which will secure them a good profit when the meat comes over to this country?—One would suppose so.

5197. From the fact of its having gone on now since October 1875, and having steadily increased notwithstanding the losses that have taken place, the probability is that that will be the ultimate result of these experiments?—Very likely.

5198. Do you consider that the importation of dead meat is likely to bring disease with it?—I could hardly give an opinion upon it, but I should fancy that they can send diseased meat without its being detected.

5199. You would represent that diseased meat would come over in the dead-meat trade without being discovered?—Yes.

5200. Of course, if it was unfit for food, it would be detected, but if it was not, you cannot give any idea whether that would be likely to spread disease?—I should fancy from what I have heard of cattle plague that it might spread it, but I do not believe it would spread pleuro-pneumonia or foot-and-mouth disease; that is, of course, out of the question.

5201. But with cattle plague there might be that danger, though a small danger?—I am not prepared to say, because they have carried the idea of infection in Germany to almost any extent. They believe that anything which has been in contact with cattle plague is able to carry it.

5202. However, dealing with this American dead-meat trade, do you believe, having watched the conditions under which that trade is now carried out, and admitting the possibility of its being made a permanent trade at the price they state, that you could establish a dead-meat trade of that kind with the Continent?—No, never.

5203. Can you give your reasons to the Committee for that statement?—The first reason would be that the supply of ice in America is unlimited, whilst at certain places on the Continent they have no ice. They must then get ice at an expense from some other place, and the additional expense, I believe, would never pay them to do it.

Chairman—continued.

5204. On that point of ice the last witness stated, and, I daresay, you are aware of the fact, that ice can be manufactured where you have not got it?—It is not done yet to a great extent.

5205. That might obviate that difficulty, might it not, supposing that it was possible?—Yes; but must we not wait until we have got it?

5206. I understood the last witness to say that it was a sufficiently ascertained fact to make it a certainty, if it was thought worth while to adopt it?—It appears to me that whether you have natural ice or whether you have manufactured ice, it is a matter of expense. If it will pay the foreigner to go to the expense, he will do it, but if it will not pay he will not do it, as in any other trade.

5207. Apart from the difficulty with regard to ice, which might be got over by invention, what are your reasons for saying that it would not pay to export dead meat from the Continent?—If it pays the American to send meat here at 6 *d.* per lb., I am certain that you would get very little meat from the Continent, because it is worth more money there.

5208. You believe that the foreign animal would find a better market than the English market, if the price was restricted to the price which is shown to afford the profit required on the American meat?—That is my opinion.

5209. Supposing that 6 *d.* per lb. was all that he could get, you do not think that the foreign farmer would undertake a dead-meat trade to England whilst he had the live-stock trade to other places open to him?—Quite so.

5210. What countries would he take his live stock to in preference to bringing it as dead meat to this country?—We must take every country seriatim. You have had evidence from Denmark that if they cannot bring cattle here at a remunerative price, they would fall back on dairy produce. When we consider that this foreign cattle trade is only 35 years old, you may expect that what the people did before, they will do again. There are several ways in which a farmer may employ his land, either for breeding cattle or for dairy purposes, or for growing corn; but you must also understand that at present the demand for meat is increasing very largely on the Continent, and that France is a great competitor with England, and takes a great deal of live stock.

5211. Therefore you believe that, supposing the import trade in live animals was prohibited, it would practically drive the foreigner to France for his market, whilst a great number of people like the farmers in Denmark would turn their attention to other methods of farming?—Yes.

5212. And that in that case we should not get a dead-meat trade substituted for the live stock supply?—No. Since the late outbreak of cattle plague, Germany has closed all its frontiers to Russia and Austria, so that in Germany proper now (excluding Schleswig-Holstein), meat is dearer than it is here. Consequently, if they kept to this rule to exclude Austrian and Russian beasts, they would require all their own, and a large supply from Schleswig-Holstein as well, in the summer; because Germany proper is divided in this way: Schleswig-Holstein produces grass cattle, and the other parts of Germany principally stall-fed cattle, and they mostly require an addition from Schleswig-Holstein to their own cattle.

Chairman—continued.

5213. I suppose that the amount of cattle from Germany proper is not so important a supply as the sheep that come from that country?—No; the supply of German cattle has been reduced very much lately.

5214. Have you any figures with regard to the importation of sheep, showing what the supply is from Germany?—I have only the statement for the last five months of last year, when the grass season commences on the 1st of July to the last of November. This is the whole foreign import. I have no other statistics from Germany separately, but I put them together to show what the import of foreign animals into London is, as compared to English animals. From the 1st of July to the 30th of November the import of foreign sheep into London has been 394,440 sold in the Islington Market. I am only speaking now of London, During the same time the English sheep sold in that market were 320,500, so that in those five months there were 73,940 more foreign sheep than English sheep sold in London.

5215. I suppose that a very large proportion of those sheep are taken through London for consumption in the large towns in the country?—Yes; they go a great many miles round London, I should say as far as 200 miles, into the manufacturing and mining districts. Now during the same time the foreign beasts sold in Islington Market were 75,430, and the English beasts sold during the same time in the Islington Market were 77,150; so that 1,720 more English beasts were sold in those five months in the Islington Market than foreign beasts. There were more English beasts sold and more foreign sheep sold.

5216. A larger proportion of foreign sheep were sold in the markets, and a larger proportion of home cattle?—That is so.

5217. Can you state how that return has been made up?—From the "Times" newspaper, which gives the return of the markets.

5218. Those figures are taken, I understand, from the official market returns which appear in the "Times"?—They are.

5219. I understand you to mean that it is not official, because it is not from the Government, but that it is a return issued by the market authority?—The clerk of the markets reports to the "Times."

5220. And it appears weekly in the "Times"?—Yes, that is from the 1st of July 1876, to the 30th of November 1876.

5221. During what you have described as the grass time?—Yes, the five grass months.

5222. Have you got the figures relating to the next six months?—I have not; because this is the principal season in which we rely upon the Schleswig-Holstein cattle. During the other season we get no Schleswig-Holstein cattle.

5223. You mean that that gives the fairest criterion of the stock imported from abroad?—Yes; I believe when we should want the foreign stock most in those five months, which are of course principally in hot weather, the importation of foreign cattle is the largest. Our sheep importation in the first six months of the year is very large; I myself sold this year, in five months, from the 1st of January to the 14th of June, 85,926 foreign sheep.

5224. And what was the number?—Very few of cattle, because they have been prohibited from

Mr. *Gebhardt.*

15 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

Germany, and only Danish, Swedish, and Spanish cattle have been allowed; and that has all been in favour of the American meat, because the supply of foreign cattle fell off.

5225. Has there been any perceptible diminution of the supply of sheep since those regulations and restrictions were imposed in consequence of the cattle plague?—The diminution did not take place so long as France kept her frontier closed. When the cattle plague broke out in Germany, as France and Germany join, they prevented the importation of sheep altogether, and consequently a great many sheep came to this country, even under the restriction of being killed at Deptford; but some time ago (I forget now the date), when France opened her frontier again, then our supply fell off about one-half every week.

5226. The supply diminished as soon as the market opened in France?—Yes.

5227. And the foreigners preferred sending their sheep to other markets to having them killed at Deptford?—Yes, and the price regulated it. It is stated as a fact that the same day when sheep were sold at Deptford at 33 *s.*, sheep made 38 *s.* in Paris. A man divided his sheep, and sent a part of them to Paris and a part of them here, and the sheep which he sent to Paris made 5 *s.* more than those which he sent here.

5228. From what reason did that difference arise?—There are lots of causes to operate against the Deptford Market. First of all, as I stated before, a great many of the foreign beasts and the foreign sheep, when they can go to the Islington Market, are allowed to go into the country, and they go, I should say, within a distance of 100 or 200 miles. A great many sheep are sold in this market to go to Liverpool, and a great many to Birmingham and as far as Plymouth; and taking the South Coast round, I should think there is not a place where they do not go to. Then in the mining districts of Wales they consume foreign mutton almost entirely, because it suits the trade. I am talking not of the Holstein sheep, but of the Merino sheep which arrive at this time of the year. Their average weight is about six stone, or 48 lbs., whilst English sheep, of course, are a great deal heavier. Then our foreign sheep are sold for less money; if we stand at the same market at Islington we never make so much for them, excepting for some extraordinarily fine Schleswig-Holstein sheep. We always make from 1½ *d.* to 2 *d.* per pound less for foreign sheep than for English sheep. A great many of those go all over the country, particularly, as I said before, to Manchester, Birmingham, Liverpool, Wales, West Bromwich, and places round the South Coast. You have not got those buyers about Deptford; you have not got the small butchers there; we are in the hands of a few large buyers. If the supply is very short, we can sell pretty freely; but if the supply is strong, we may sometimes sacrifice them for very bad prices, because there is no competition.

5229. And that tends, of course, to diminish the export?—If the sender can get a better price in Paris than in London, then he goes to Paris.

5230. On that ground you object to the restrictions which compel the slaughter of the sheep at Deptford?—I think that it is totally useless, because we are not allowed to introduce a sheep with disease. After the sheep have been 12 hours in quarantine, they are every one singly turned over on their backs and examined, and then they are allowed to go away, and they are taken to the market.

Chairman—continued.

5231. I understood you to say just now that the supply had fallen off very seriously as soon as France opened her boundaries?—Yes.

5232. Has the price to the consumer gone up in consequence?—The price is so irregular at Deptford, that when the regulations were taken off in France, I think, the price in one week by the diminished supply rose 6 *s.* per head at Deptford, which would, of course, be 1½ *d.* per pound upon a sheep of 48 lbs.

5233. That has been a distinct rise to the consumer?—Yes; and then the next week, perhaps, we may have a bad meat market. Our meat market regulates the live trade; and lately, when there has been such a glut of American meat in the market, we have been obliged to sell our sheep lower as well. The fact is, that the Deptford Market is a very irregular trade; it varies much more than the other markets.

5234. And that irregularity, as you say, stops the sending of the animals to this country?—Yes; because a man does not know, when he sends his things away, what he may get for them.

5235. I suppose that sheep are allowed not to be so liable to introduce disease into the country as cattle are?—I believe not.

5236. Therefore, in your opinion, there is not the same necessity for slaughtering sheep at the port of arrival?—There is not.

5237. Supposing that the import of live animals were stopped, do you believe that what has been stated would be the case, viz., that the home supplies would increase so largely as to fill up the gap?—If they could make England larger they would increase, but I do not know whether they could find the land to put them upon.

5238. Do you say that the land is now stocked up to its full carrying power?—I believe it is, because if it does not pay a farmer to breed cattle when either mutton or beef fetches in the market such a price as it does now, I do not know what would induce him to breed.

5239. Therefore you do not, from your practical knowledge as a farmer, think that the security would induce him to breed more extensively than he does at present, because you believe that the grazing power of the country is fully taxed?—That is my opinion.

5240. I suppose that you object to this idea of stopping the import of live animals, on the ground that it is a direct attack upon the free-trade principle which has been established, and which is gradully spreading as between countries?—Yes.

5241. With regard to a question which we had before us, and on which we had a good deal of evidence before the Committee of 1873, and which has also been mentioned here several times, viz., the importation of offal; it was stated that a large number of people, in this town especially, depended very much upon that supply; have you at all considered the question since you gave your evidence before the Committee of 1873?—Yes, I have had before me everyday experience of that.

5242. Supposing that the animal was brought over here as meat killed, would you be able to bring the offal under the same conditions?—Certainly

Chairman—continued.

tainly not. It has been tried, and it has always failed. I am not an importer, but I have seen it tried, and it has failed.

5243. Do you think it would be possible to bring it under the conditions under which they are now treating the American meat?—It appears to me that it cannot be done, because the Americans do not do it; they have tried it.

5244. I understood the American witness to say that they do not do it, because they find a market for every part of the offal in their own country; but from a country like Schleswig-Holstein, where they state to us that there is no market for offal, from the population being very sparse, would it be possible, under the conditions of the refrigerating process, to bring the offal over here in a saleable condition?—I am positive that it cannot be done, because anybody who has any practical knowledge of this subject, knows that if, in warm weather, offal (by which I mean the liver, the heart, and the head) is not consumed the next day almost it spoils, because the fact of there being blood and things attaching to it soon decays it. It is always a great object with the butcher to dispose of his offal for consumption as soon as he can.

5245. We had one witness called before the Committee of 1873, who had a different opinion from your own with regard to this matter, and Professor Brown has stated here that he believes that a certain quantity of offal is brought from abroad at the present moment for sale in this country, and I think he said that some of it came from Vienna; and the witness before the Committee of 1873, Mr. Robinson, stated that he knew that offal could be imported from abroad in a condition in which it was saleable in this country; you differ from them?—As regards Professor Brown's statement, when he was asked the question whether he had any proof (because I told Mr. Norwood, the Member for Hull, about it), he said that he had no proof, but that he only heard so. As regards what Mr. Robinson said, I do not care; my experience is quite as good as his. I know that it has been tried, and it cannot be done; it has not succeeded, and it never will succeed, and the offal question is a very great question for the poor.

5246. You state that it is not practicable to bring offal over into this country, and to sell it in competition with fresh-killed offal?—I do not believe that it is possible to establish a trade in it.

5247. Even under the refrigerating system by which the meat is brought over sound to this country?—I believe it is impossible.

Chairman—continued.

5248. Do you think that the trade would be as easily regulated as it is at the present moment, if it was all a dead-meat trade?—I believe that if you made all the foreign meat come dead to this market, and American meat should continue to come, the one would spoil the other; there would be a lot of meat in London which could not be consumed. If it did not pay people to send it, they would leave off sending it, and in the country, where they really wanted the meat, they could not get it.

5249. Would it not regulate itself?—I think not. If it does not pay a man to send goods to a country, he will not send them.

5250. We have heard that the American meat can be kept for any given time in the atmosphere in which it is brought over; would you not be able to regulate the trade, as against a glut of the market in that way, by maintaining the meat in the temperature in which it is brought over until it is wanted in the market?—Yes; but if the Americans can do it, why do they not do it? As I tell you this morning, three waggon-loads of meat have gone to be boiled down at Deptford. If a man knows how to protect his goods, it is very odd that he does not do it.

5251. You do not think that that may be merely the result, as the witnesses have said, of these experiments before a settled trade has been established, and that this result would not occur when the system of bringing over the meat had been once matured?—Of course I am not able to say what they might do, but at present they have failed greatly in many respects.

5252. Do you think that the supply of this American meat, as Mr. Lyons, a London butcher, stated, has been a great relief to the London market lately?—I believe it has; I do not know what the price of meat would have been if it had not been for the American beef. I think it would have been very high, considering that we lost all the Continental supply through cattle-plague.

5253. And prices have been kept down by the fact of the American supply having taken the place of the foreign import?—That is so.

5254. That being so, if the American supply was a permanent trade, it would make the foreign import rather less important, would it not?—Yes; if the Americans can supply you with sound meat for 6*d.* per pound, I believe the foreign trade would be reduced very soon, particularly if you did not let the cattle go free into the country.

5255. That you think might be left to the natural competition of the trade?—Yes.

Monday, 18th June 1877.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Major Allen.
Mr. Anderson.
Mr. Assheton.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Chaplin.
Mr. Dease.
Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.
Mr. Elliot.
Mr. W. E. Forster.
Mr. French.
Mr. King Harman.
Mr. John Holms.
Sir George Jenkinson.
Colonel Kingscote.
Sir Rainald Knightley.
Mr. M'Lagan.
Mr. Mundella.
Mr. Murphy.
Mr. Norwood.
Mr. Arthur Peel.
Mr. Ritchie.
Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.
Mr. Torr.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON, BART., IN THE CHAIR.

The Right Honourable FRANCIS WILLIAM, Baron FITZHARDINGE, attending by permission of the House of Lords; Examined.

Right Hon. Baron *Fitzhardinge.*

18 June 1877.

Chairman.

5256. I BELIEVE that your Lordship has taken some interest in the question of the introduction of cattle from Ireland?—Yes, more particularly with regard to the counties of Gloucester and Bristol.

5257. Can you speak with regard to the present conditions of the trade in which those cattle are brought upon the market in Bristol?—We have not allowed any Irish cattle to come into the county of Gloucester for the last two months.

5258. The Irish cattle have been prohibited?—Yes.

5259. Have any Irish cattle been brought in notwithstanding that prohibition?—Not to my knowledge.

5260. Are there any Government inspectors at each of the ports?—There are none for Gloucestershire that I can find; there are two for Bristol, but Bristol cattle are landed in Somersetshire, and the Bristol cattle market is also in Somersetshire.

5261. Your Lordship means that because in Gloucestershire the regulations are not adopted that are adopted in other counties, cattle are landed there, notwithstanding the stoppage of trade on the part of the authorities of your county?—They are landed at numerous places where there is no inspector at all. On the 26th of February I was in company with my farm agent, and we met 97 head of Irish cattle about 20 miles from Bristol. We stopped them, and asked the men with them where they were going to, and where they came from. We were told that they came from Cork, and arrived at Bristol early in the morning; they could have landed at the docks at Avon-mouth, but they did not; they came 20 miles up the river. They were consigned inland to a place called Purton, and they came from Sharpness Point, and had to go back a distance of 20 miles to Bristol. They came right through my land.

Chairman—continued.

5262. Through a district where import was prohibited?—Not at that time; but in consequence of these cattle having been smuggled into the county, and taken back there again, the owners of stock took the question up, and asked me to bring this matter before the court of quarter sessions, with a view of stopping the importation of Irish cattle into the county.

5263. That was the origin of the regulation prohibiting the entry of Irish cattle for the last two months?—Yes.

5264. Was the object of their landing there before you discovered them, instead of landing at the port for Bristol, the desire to evade inspection?—That is the common opinion.

5265. The inspectors are at Bristol?—There are two Government inspectors at Bristol; they inspect the cattle, but they have nothing to do with the sheep or pigs. The local inspector does not inspect the pigs, but he meets them on the following day in the market, and if he can detect a diseased sheep, or a diseased pig in the market, he brings the matter before the magistrates; if he proves his case, the man is fined, and the inspector gets half the fine, and that is how he is paid.

5266. The local inspector is paid a premium on detection?—That is so.

5267. And the Government inspector has nothing to do with that?—The two Government inspectors have nothing to do with either sheep or pigs.

5268. But they have authority over the introduction of cattle?—Yes.

5269. What regulations would your Lordship represent to this Committee ought to be adopted with a view of doing away with such evasions of the regulations as that which you have described?—At Bristol the whole ought to be under the Government. For instance, there is nobody at New Docks, Avon-mouth, to inspect cattle or sheep; there

Chairman—continued.

there ought to be a recognised inspector. They have frequently landed cattle on the bank of the river at Aust about 10 miles from Bristol and at other places; and they bring them up the canal a distance of 14 or 15 miles through a dairy district, and land them three miles short of Gloucester, at Quedgley, where there is no inspector, and then they are driven into the market at Gloucester.

5270. In fact, you would suggest that the places where they could land cattle from Ireland should be all defined, and that inspectors should be appointed by the Government, who should have the inspection of those cattle on landing at those ports?—Yes, in the case of cattle, and also sheep and pigs.

5271. Do you attribute any outbreaks of pleuro-pneumonia or foot-and-mouth disease to the laxity of the regulations at the present moment?—When foot-and-mouth disease breaks out it always works from Bristol and then up eastward.

5272. It works along the line of the driving of these Irish cattle?—Yes, just so.

5273. I suppose that all this district is a dairy district?—It is.

5274. And therefore it is very liable to suffer from the passage of diseased animals?—It is. Up to Gloucester it is all a dairy district.

5275. At present the inspection is simply at Bristol, and not at the port where the cattle may be landed for the Bristol market?—It is simply at Bristol. There is a new dock just opened at Avon-mouth, but there is no inspector there.

5276. And therefore any cattle from Ireland that were inspected would not go to Bristol where they would be inspected on landing, but to other places at which they would not be inspected, and from which they are distributed throughout the county?—That is so.

5277. Has your Lordship at all considered the question of the attempt which has been suggested by certain witnesses to stamp out pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease in this country; my question is with a view of ascertaining whether the farmers in your neighbourhood, in your opinion, would be willing to submit to regulations for that object?—They would be perfectly willing.

5278. Even if those regulations were so strict as to close the markets and fairs for a considerable time, or to place restrictions upon the movement of cattle with the object of doing away with foot-and-mouth disease?—Even then, I am sure they would not object.

5279. And your Lordship would say that the regulations that applied to England, either for checking the movement of cattle or for restricting markets, should apply equally to Ireland as part of the United Kingdom, and as being a place upon which we depend very much for stock, and from which we are liable to receive disease?—We are not only liable to receive disease, but some sheep came into Bristol last Wednesday with foot-and-mouth disease, and there were some pigs that came into Bristol one month ago which had it.

5280. Witnesses before this Committee have made a great distinction as between stamping out pleuro-pneumonia and stamping out foot-and-mouth disease; do you believe that the farmers would be willing to submit to regulations for doing away with foot-and-mouth disease as well as pleuro-pneumonia?—I do. As long as they

Chairman—continued.

can escape the disease, they are willing to put up with anything.

5281. It was stated before the Committee of 1873, and it has also been stated by witnesses here, that although they would be willing to put up with restrictions to stamp out pleuro-pneumonia, believing that that could be stamped out, yet that foot-and-mouth disease is not so dangerous a complaint, that they do not lose the same proportion of their cattle from it, and that therefore the regulations which would be necessary to stamp it out might be too severe; do you agree with those witnesses?—The farmers are getting very shy of buying pigs. There is a great trade amongst the farmers in our country in fattening pigs. For instance, a tenant of mine next door to me is a great man for pigs, but he will not buy a pig now simply because he is afraid to go into the Bristol or Gloucester market, because he thinks that then he would have his cattle affected with foot-and-mouth disease.

5282. You think that pigs carry foot-and-mouth disease?—There is no doubt about it.

5283. Are those Irish or English pigs?—Both, Irish or English pigs.

5284. In fact, they hesitate now in buying any stock of pigs for their farms?—They do.

5285. But I understand you to speak principally with regard to the restrictions which you think ought to be imposed as to the landing of Irish cattle for the protection of the farmer against pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease?—Quite so.

5286. Is there any other point upon which your Lordship wishes to speak?—I think not.

Colonel *Kingscote.*

5287. The district which you have mentioned lying between Gloucester and Bristol is essentially a dairy district, is it not?—It is nothing but a dairy district.

5288. And from your own knowledge, very heavy losses have been sustained by farmers in that district, from foot-and-mouth disease spreading into Wiltshire?—Yes, and if they get it again, half the farmers in the county will be broken.

5289. Are you aware that this is the difference between the local inspectors and the Government inspectors; that the Government inspector can only stop cattle which are diseased, but cannot stop sheep and pigs; but that the local inspector can stop anything coming from on board ship if he finds it to be suffering from disease?—The local inspector is not there; he is in the market; he does not meet them on landing.

5290. But he could do so, could he not?—I think not. Two Government inspectors meet the cattle; the local inspector goes into the market the following day. The cattle land there on the Wednesday, and the market is on the Thursday.

5291. If the local inspector finds disease and prosecutes a man, he gets half the fine, does he not?—He gets half the fine.

Chairman.

5292. That is after the cattle are in the market?—Yes.

Colonel *Kingscote.*

5293. Does that apply to cattle, sheep, or pigs?—It applies to cattle, sheep, or pigs. After

Right Hon. Baron *Fitzhardinge.*

18 June 1877.

Colonel *Kingscote*—continued.

they are in the market, if they are diseased, he prosecutes the man, and on conviction he gets half the fine, whatever it may be.

5294. From those with whom you have been in communication, you know that there have been cases of foot-and-mouth disease both among sheep and pigs in the British market within the last month?—I cannot say that there have been in the Bristol market, but sheep which were landed last Wednesday were in a fearful state. There were some pigs landed in the last Wednesday in May which were in a very bad state; but whether they were taken into the market or not I cannot say; they came from the same ship as the cattle did.

5295. And they were landed with foot-and-mouth disease?—They were landed with foot-and-mouth disease.

Mr. *Anderson.*

5296. Does your Lordship mean that this was a wilful and deliberate importation of diseased cattle by parties who brought them in, knowing them to be diseased?—I should be sorry to say that, but disease may break out during the passage.

5297. But they took a roundabout way of getting to Bristol market, which must be much more expensive and troublesome to them; what do you suppose was the object of that?—I cannot tell the reason for that, more than that they came up the River Severn 20 miles, and they were driven back to a fair 20 miles away through a dairy district.

5298. That is a more expensive way of getting them to market, is it not?—I could not say that. I have heard it reported that when those cattle were landed the man saved 15 *l.* by the job.

5299. Was that by his escaping the dues?—He would have to pay the dock dues at Sharpness Point.

5300. Then how would he save the money?—In the vessel in which they came, the "Henry Allen," these 97 head of cattle were carried as a deck-cargo. She is not properly constructed to convey beasts, though she very often conveys them; but she is not properly fitted up for cattle.

5301. Then do you suppose that the disease broke out in consequence of these mal-arrangements for carrying the animals, or that they were delivered to the ship in a bad state?—I do not think that those cattle were shipped in a bad state.

5302. You think, therefore, that it is owing to the mal-arrangements for the trade on board the ship that disease breaks out on the way?—There is no inspector at Gloucester, and nobody knows whether a vessel is disinfected on arriving, after the cattle are landed.

5303. We have had evidence here that the traffic from Ireland to Glasgow was also conducted in such a way that foot-and-mouth disease broke out on board the ship, so that your Lordship's evidence very much strengthens the supposition that mal-arrangements for the traffic tend to promote disease on board the ship?—I should think so.

5304. Then there are no sufficient arrangements of inspection at the ports to prevent these mal-arrangements?—There is no inspector at all in several of the ports.

Sir *George Jenkinson.*

5305. I think that the chief point of your Lordship's evidence is in the direction of showing the great want of proper inspection, is it not?—There is no inspection at all on landing, except in the case of cattle.

5306. In point of fact, is it your opinion that the whole of the arrangements as to inspectors, at all events, in so large a port as Bristol, ought to be under the orders of the central government?—Certainly; it is not only at Bristol, but at Gloucester too, and at Sharpness Point.

5307. The whole of the district?—Yes.

5308. You know as a fact, do you not, that at least one large cargo of animals has passed from 20 to 30 miles up the Severn, and has come back by road past my place, and gone that way to Bristol, thus evading detection altogether?—I saw them myself, and made inquiries of the sergeant of police, and the pilot who had charge of the vessel.

5309. And it is possible to land at a great many places where there is no inspection whatever?—They may land at New Passage; they have landed frequently at Aust; it is possible for them to land at Oldbury; they have landed at Lydney, and, in fact, at almost any point between Gloucester and Sharpness Point, a distance of 16 miles; and they have frequently landed at Quedgley, within three miles of Gloucester.

5310. So that, in point of fact, unless the Government takes in hand the proper supervision of landing of cattle in the whole of that district, the present means of inspection is a perfect farce?—It is a perfect farce.

5311. And any amount of disease from Ireland or elsewhere can be introduced into that dairy district, under the present arrangement, without any check whatever?—That is so.

5312. Is it not a fact that if any cargoes should come from any other place excepting Ireland, they can be landed?—They can be smuggled into the country at many points without any inspection.

5313. There is nothing to stop anything coming in?—Not that I am aware of; they can land them on the banks of the river.

5314. With regard to more stringent arrangements issuing from the central authority, do you agree with a former witness (I think it was Professor Brown), who stated that it was of no use to make more stringent regulations, because the farmers would not stand them?—The farmers in our part of the world would be only too delighted to have more stringent regulations.

5315. Then I take it that you think that any witness who stated that, could not have had the authority of the general body of farmers?—Anybody who said that must have been ignorant of the dairy farmers of the county of Gloucester.

5316. Have you lately sent any person to see the landing of diseased cattle at Bristol?—I have sent my farm steward.

5317. Are any of those persons available as witnesses?—There is one in the room at present.

5318. Is either of the inspectors from Bristol available?—They are not here.

Mr. *W. E. Forster.*

5319. You said in answer to a question which was put to you by the honourable Baronet, the member for North Wilts, that cattle could come in

Right Hon. Baron *Fitzhardinge.*

18 June 1877.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

in from Ireland or elsewhere; I suppose your objection is to the Irish cattle, and sheep, and pigs?—It is with regard to Irish cattle; we do not have any foreign cattle that way; they come from Southampton to Bristol market.

5320. You are aware, I suppose, that, according to the law, cattle from the Continent can only be landed at certain points, where they must be inspected?—Yes.

5321. And that if they come in at other ports, it must be by smuggling, with a great danger of the whole cargo being forfeited, and other punishments being incurred?—Yes.

5322. In the case of that cargo in which you said there was a large number of sheep with foot-and-mouth disease, what was the size of that cargo altogether?—About 2,300 head.

5323. Were they all sheep?—No, it was a mixed cargo of cattle, sheep, and pigs.

5324. I suppose they were chiefly sheep?—I was not present, but my agent saw them.

5325. Did your agent inform you that it was the sheep that had the foot-and-mouth disease?—The sheep and pigs; he is here, and he will be able to give evidence.

5326. I suppose that there was no attempt made either to slaughter or to isolate the cattle and the sheep that had been in contact with the animals that had had the disease?—The pigs were put into a cart and conveyed away somewhere; where I do not exactly know.

5327. You say that you have prohibited the import of Irish beasts into Gloucestershire?—Yes.

5328. When was that done?—I think it was on the 20th of March at quarter sessions.

5329. That, I suppose, was done under the permissive powers given by the Cattle Plague Order?—I was asked by the farmers to bring the matter before the quarter sessions, and after discussion it was carried unanimously.

5330. But can you inform us whether the power which you had to issue that Order was not in consequence of the breaking out of cattle plague in London, and the permissive authority that was given to the different districts to pass strict regulations?—I am not aware.

5331. You do not know under what Order of the Privy Council you had the discretion to pass that regulation?—I do not.

5332. But you have passed an Order at your quarter sessions, prohibiting the import, I suppose, into the county of Gloucester, of any cattle from Ireland or from anywhere else?—Yes.

5333. Is yours the only county in that neighbourhood that has done that?—No; Worcestershire and Warwickshire, I think, have done the same.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

5334. When that matter was under discussion at the Quarter Sessions, what you were considering were only pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease, I suppose; cattle plague did not come under your consideration?—No, we never had cattle plague there.

5335. Then it was from the necessity to guard against pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease, that you passed that Order?—That was it, and from the smuggling of cattle up the river and back again.

5336. The smuggling of cattle from Ireland, I suppose, you mean?—Yes.

5337. But it was from the fear of those two diseases, pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease, that you passed this strict Order?—That was the principal reason.

5338. What you suggest, I think, is that there should be an inspection for every cargo of cattle, or sheep, or pigs, that arrives in the country from Ireland?—Just so.

5339. You are aware, I suppose, of an Act that was passed last year, which requires the Irish Government to appoint inspectors at the port of departure?—Only generally.

5340. You are not aware, I suppose, that the Order of Council under which you had power to make the regulations which were made, prohibiting the import of cattle into Gloucestershire, has been revoked from the 30th instant, by an Order that was gazetted last Friday?—I understand that it is to come to an end.

5341. You were informed of the fact, that this Order which you have made prohibiting the import of cattle from Ireland, or elsewhere, must come to an end, because your powers, after the 30th instant, will cease?—I thought that our time expired to-morrow.

Chairman.

5342. It is your local time that you think expires?—Yes.

Sir *George Jenkinson.*

5343. Is it not a fact that there was a meeting of the local authority at Gloucester on Saturday last, with a view of revoking the Order which the Right honourable Gentleman alludes to?—I was not aware of it.

Chairman.

5344. I gather that your Lordship would suggest that whilst you are protected by inspection as against the importation of foreign cattle, yet, inasmuch as you suffer from the introduction of foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia from Ireland, certain ports should be assigned for their landing, and that those ports should be properly inspected?—Quite so.

Mr. JAMES PETERS, called in; and Examined.

Mr. *Peters.*

Chairman.

5345. I BELIEVE you are the Land Agent of Lord Fitzhardinge?—Yes.

5346. You have heard his Lordship's evidence?—I have.

5347. In that evidence he has spoken of certain cargoes being landed at Bristol affected with foot-and-mouth disease coming from Ireland; are you personally able to speak to that fact?—Yes, I have seen them.

Chairman—continued.

5348. You yourself were present on the landing of the cattle?—Yes, at Bristol.

5349. And they were affected with foot-and-mouth disease?—The pigs were.

5350. Were there any cattle in the same cargo?—There were lots of cattle, but they were not infected.

5351. They formed part of a cargo in which the

Mr. *Peters.*

18 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

the sheep and pigs were affected with foot-and-mouth disease?—Yes, they were mixed.

5352. And those were taken direct into the market at Bristol?—They were landed the day before the market, on Wednesday, the 23rd of May.

5353. There was no inspection of those animals?—The two Government inspectors were there.

5354. And they had no authority to stop them?—They had no authority to stop them.

5355. And, consequently, although you were quite aware, and the Government inspectors were aware of the landing of those animals, they went forward into the market?—They drove them where they liked; they took them right away. There were about 4,000 head landed the day I was down of cattle, sheep, and pigs; all landed in the course of two hours, and taken right away.

5356. Do you mean that all those 4,000 were either affected with disease, or came out of the ship's cargo that had the disease on board?—The healthy animals were surrounded by the infected animals.

5357. Are you aware that the very fact of their being so driven along any road would be an infringement of the Act?—The infected animals were taken away in that case, but mixed along with the other animals; they were not able to walk.

5358. But still you say that those infected animals were mixed with the other animals that were allowed to circulate freely?—They were all landed and driven together; they were all in the same boat; over 2,000 head.

5359. Have you seen any of the cargoes that have been landed at those other ports that his Lordship spoke of?—I saw a cargo of cattle that was landed at Sharpness Point on the 26th or 27th of February.

5360. Were those affected with the disease?—I could not say that they were.

5361. But they were landed at Sharpness Point, and driven from there to the Bristol market?—Yes; about 20 miles.

5362. Instead of being landed at Avonmouth or Bristol?—Yes.

Mr. *Mundella.*

5363. You have no doubt at all that, of those 2,000 head of cattle, a certain proportion were affected with foot-and-mouth disease?—Not the cattle; the pigs were.

5364. You have no doubt about that?—I am quite sure about it; it was pointed out to me by the veterinary inspector; he drew my attention to it.

5365. And they agreed with you that they were affected with foot-and-mouth disease?—They drew my attention to it, and took me to the cases.

Sir *George Jenkinson.*

5366. I think you said that the Government inspector saw these diseased cattle as well as yourself?—Yes; and the only power that they have at present, they told me, is to report it to the local authorities and to the Government.

5367. Did they, in point of fact, take any steps?—They reported it to the town clerk of Bristol.

5368. What was the result?—I do not know.

5369. It has been pointed out by the Right honourable gentleman, the Member for Bradford, that in moving the cattle at all the Act has been broken?—They may remove them in a cart where they think proper.

5370. Was there no person there, either inspector, or local authority, or magistrate, to prevent the Act being broken?—No; there was no local authority at all; only the two Government inspectors.

Mr. *Anderson.*

5371. The cattle that were landed out of the river, you say, were not diseased?—I cannot say, I am sure; they looked very bad.

5372. Do you know the reason for landing them up the river, and driving them back to Bristol; is there any saving of expense?—They get their cattle up light, and all that sort of thing, and get them fresh, and drive them into farmers' fields going down the 20 miles, by which they get them into nice condition very often.

5373. They get them into the Bristol market in better condition that way than if they landed them at Bristol?—They get them rested on the road, and turn them into a farmer's field at night, and pay nothing.

5374. Do you know whether there is any saving in expense also?—I am not aware of that.

Colonel *Kingscote.*

5375. Did you go on board the boat yourself at Bristol from which any of the cattle, or sheep, or pigs were landed?—Yes; I was there the whole time when the ship arrived.

5376. Were they in a bad state?—Yes; the cattle were in a very bad state.

5377. Were they very crowded?—They were, indeed; 2,000 head came up the Avon in one of those boats; and you may expect that they were crowded in one vessel.

5378. How many vessels were there?—Four; one from Cork, two from Waterford, and one from Dublin.

5379. Do you know the number of cattle, sheep, and pigs in all four vessels?—I should think there were over 4,000 head altogether; but I could not say exactly.

5380. When you spoke to the Government inspector, was he on board or was he in the Bristol Market?—He was seeing the animals landed at the port.

5381. You spoke to him at the time?—Yes; I was speaking to him, and he drew my attention to some pigs which were affected with foot-and-mouth disease. There have been several more cargoes. Last Saturday week there were 12 sheep, the worst cases the inspector had seen with foot-and-mouth disease. They reported them to the local authority, the town clerk, and to the Government; they were driven away in carts along with the rest of the flock.

5382. You do not know where they were taken to?—Not to be certain.

5383. You do not know whether they were taken to be butchered or to be turned out?—They were not killed.

5384. As regards driving those cattle from Sharpness Point to Bristol, you have seen the cattle yourself, you say?—Yes.

5385. Do you know of your own knowledge that they very often do turn them into farmer's fields at night?—Yes; I know that on very good authority.

Mr. *Peters.*

18 June 1877.

Mr. *Arthur Peel.*

5386. You say that you have been on board the vessels when they have arrived at the port?—Yes.

5387. Did you notice whether any provisions were made for the proper treatment of the animals on board?—Not the least. Sometimes I have known as many as 30 animals die on the voyage over

5388. Have you any reason to suppose that any animals were thrown overboard during the passage?—No; I never heard that.

5389. It has been stated here in evidence that the state of the vessels was such as to be likely to induce foot-and-mouth disease; do you believe that statement to be correct?—I should think that the over-crowding was sufficient to cause any disease.

Chairman.

5390. I understood you to say that the inspector himself called your attention to the fact of those animals being affected?—Yes; the pigs.

5391. Was the inspector present when they carried them away in carts?—Yes; he said they were to be killed.

5392. Are you aware that the Government inspector, to carry out the Act, has all the powers of the local inspector?—I am informed that they have not the powers of the local inspectors.

5393. Who informed you so?—The inspector.

Chairman—continued.

5394. All that I understood you to say was, that the inspector called your attention to the fact that these animals had the foot-and-mouth disease developed on them, and that he was present when they were put into carts and carried away?—Yes.

5395. Can you remember whether you discussed the question of his having authority to stop them or not?—I did.

5396. And he told you that he had no authority to stop their being so carried?—Not in the least, any more than report it to the authorities and the Government.

5397. Was he the usual Government inspector at the port of Bristol?—Yes.

5398. Were both the inspectors present on that occasion?—The two inspectors were present.

5399. Both the Government inspectors?—The two Government inspectors.

5400. Would you tell me the name of the inspector who made that statement to you?—I can give you the name if I am at liberty to do so.

5401. Clearly; in fact you must do so?—It was Mr. May, the head inspector.

5402. What is the name of the other inspector?—Mr. Broad.

5403. Was that the cargo that you saw in February?—No, on the 23rd of May.

Mr. *Gebhardt.*

Mr. Herrman Gebhardt, re-called; and further Examined.

Chairman.

5404. Has your attention been called since our last meeting to a statement that has appeared in one of the journals throwing some little doubt upon the figures that you quoted with regard to the market?—Yes.

5405. Have you taken any steps to verify those figures?—I have here an official statement from the Metropolitan Cattle Market, and the figures are very nearly the same as mine; only they are, if anything, more favourable.

5406. Will you read out what the clerk of the market has given you as the official figures?—These are the figures from the 1st of July to the 30th of November 1876. The number of British beasts sold in the Islington Market was 76,715, and the number of foreign beasts sold in the same period in the same market, were 75,460. The number of British sheep sold in the same time was 316,140, and the number of foreign sheep was 395,940.

5407. There is a slight difference in the number of sheep that you now give as compared with the figures that you gave us the other day, but still the number of foreign sheep is very much larger than of the home supply?—Yes, the clerk of the market makes it 4,316 English sheep fewer than I made, and he makes it 1,500 more foreign sheep than I made. He makes it 435 English beasts fewer than I made, and 30 foreign beasts more; so that the difference is not very great altogether.

5408. Those are the official records of the comparative numbers of English and foreign animals that have been in the market?—Yes. By permission of the chairman of the market committee I got these official figures.

Chairman—continued.

5409. And that is for the five months from July to November?—Yes, it is in the grass season.

5410. That is, I understood you before to say, the time when most of the foreign import comes over?—Yes. He has given me the other six months as well; he has given me from the 1st of January to the 30th of June 1876 in the same year, which is the spring and winter season. There the figures are quite different; the British cattle shown in the market then were 81,480, and the foreign cattle were 32,640. The number of English sheep was 489,600, and the number of foreign sheep was 353,150.

5411. Through those months the home trade supplies the market principally?—In those months the home trade in cattle is more than double the foreign trade; and the difference in sheep is about 130,000.

5412. What would that give for the whole year as a comparison between the British and foreign supplies?—I have given 11 months only; the last month is not given. I make it about 800,000 English sheep against 750,000 foreign sheep for the whole year. Then I make the beasts on a rough calculation about 108,000 foreigners against 158,000 English.

5413. That is very near the whole supply of foreign animals that comes into this market?—Yes, that is to London.

5414. I think in your examination last Friday, you were considering the import of dead meat from America as affecting the London market; supposing that instead of a live meat trade, a permanent dead-meat trade were formed from the Continent, how do you think it would affect the

Mr. *Gebhardt.*

18 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

London markets themselves, taking in conjunction with it the present supply of dead meat from America?—I really believe that it could not be sold. It appears from these figures that we import from the Continent in five months of the year a great many more than 4,000 foreign beasts a week. According to the figures which we have had before us, about 3,000 American carcases of beef come in. That would make about 7,000 carcases of beef to be thrown into one market, which is, from my experience, impossible to be sold in London, because a great deal of this foreign meat is very inferior meat; when it can leave London alive it goes in the country and I think in London it would be valueless dead.

5415. You mean that when there is a glut at any time, if it is alive, the surplus that is not wanted in London can be spread over the country?—Yes.

5416. And if it were all killed you would not be able to travel it sufficiently well to sell it in the country districts to get rid of the glut; is that what you mean?—That is what I mean; I mean to say that if we have 4,000 foreign beasts and 23,000 foreign sheep, against 11,500 English sheep, half of those beasts and sheep, and perhaps more than half, would go within a radius of 200 miles of London, to Manchester, Birmingham, Liverpool, and Wales, and then again all along the south coast as far as Plymouth, and, I believe, every place right round the coast, and back again up to London by Gravesend, and those places. They come and buy foreign meat. We have some very good foreign beasts and sheep, but we have a great many very middling, or inferior ones, and this meat is particularly required for the mining and manufacturing districts. We should have such a lot here that we should not know what to do with it, and they would want it, and they could not get it.

5417. You mean to say that when you are obliged to slaughter the foreign animals you glut the market at particular times, and you cannot distribute the supply so well as you can if you are allowed to circulate the animals alive?—It is totally impossible.

5418. And the American meat supply you consider really makes that difficulty even greater?—Of course. Supposing that a thousand quarters of meat came into the metropolitan market, the evidence has shown that the American meat must be sold soon after it leaves the ship. This foreign meat must be killed at Deptford; all this meat must go to one market, and the market is so glutted occasionally that there is no sale; you would sell lots of meat at a great sacrifice, independently of what might be spoilt, so that you would ruin the two trades.

5419. You mean that it would reduce the price so as to prevent the trade being sufficiently profitable to induce the exporters to send cattle over?—That is it. The foreigner has two markets, and is not bound to come here. To-day, for the sake of argument, there is a supply of 7,000 sheep at Deptford. If France had not opened her frontier there would have been quite double that number; a little while ago we had 24,000.

5420. That is because the sheep are now allowed to circulate freely in France, and are taken away by that market?—Yes; and in reality that class of meat is dearer in Paris at the present moment than it is here.

Chairman—continued.

5421. Has the shortness of the supply very much increased the price to the consumer here?—I will not say that the consumer here has had the benefit of it. I believe that in the tremendously bad trades that we have had the butcher gets the benefit, because he raises his prices very quickly, and he goes down very slowly; and I believe this American meat has been a godsend to a good many of these butchers, because I have no hesitation in saying that they have bought lots of it for 4 *d.* per pound, and after they have cut the outside off, I should think they have charged the full price for it that they would have charged for English meat.

5422. What you mean to say is, that we have been eating American meat and paying English prices for it, and that the butchers have reaped an advantage in that way?—Yes; I have not found the butchers very anxious to come here and give evidence, because this American dead-meat trade suits them uncommonly well. Last Friday cart loads of meat were carted away from the Metropolitan Meat Market and boiled down at Deptford; and on Saturday the weather was just as hot, and American meat arrived in very fair condition, and sold at a fair price; so that the trade appears to me to be so wonderfully uncertain, that there is no reliance upon it, and when it comes it must be sold, no matter what it fetches. I have in my pocket sale-notes from the meat markets where the meat has been sold at 2 *d.* per pound.

5423. That I understand to refer to a good deal of this meat which has been described as bad, in consequence of the condition in which it was sent over, as to packing and otherwise?—There must be some fault. I will not fix myself to a date, but not many weeks ago a cargo of American meat came over; the first day it made 7 *d.* per pound in the Metropolitan Meat Market; this cargo arrived in Liverpool, and a portion of it was sent up each day; the next day it made 4 *d.* per pound; the next day it made 2 *d.* per pound, and the remainder was seized. I have figures here to show that in four days they destroyed no less than 14 tons.

5424. Are you aware that a witness who deals in American meat has stated that those facts really arose in a great measure from their not finding it come over in as good order as they thought, and forwarding it at once to London, as they could not sell it in Liverpool?—Yes, but those are the results of the same cargo coming up in three days; so that it showed that the longer he kept it the worse it got, and at last it came down from 7 *d.* to 2 *d.*, and then to nothing. What would be the effect if you brought all your foreign cattle to Deptford, and slaughtered them all, and brought all the meat to one market in warm weather, when meat must be sold in a very short time?

5425. The consumer would benefit momentarily by the reduction of price, but you think that the trade would not be continued?—They would not continue the trade. There may be great improvements to be made in the American trade, but I do not believe that it is a trade to be relied upon.

5426. You would admit that if the conditions under which they can send over their meat in good order here were carried out, and the meat arrives in good order, it would be a great boon to the country, as reducing the price to the consumer?

Chairman—continued.

sumer?—Certainly; and I have not the slightest doubt that, by science and by being more careful, they will succeed.

5427. And when they do succeed, you believe that the meat will be saleable in the London market, and that still the foreign cattle will come in and compete with it at the price at which it is being sold?—The foreign cattle would partly go to a different market; they can distribute the foreign cattle over a large area.

5428. But supposing that these conditions under which they state that they can convey and keep this American meat are carried out, will not that dead meat eventually take the place of your live animals, so that the dead meat will travel into the districts instead of the live animals?—There is a very good answer to that. Why do the Americans now try all they know to bring the beasts alive? I have not got the number, but there are a great many live American beast in the Metropolitan Meat Market; 127 American beasts were sold at Southampton yesterday. When American beasts are good, and are of the English breed, they are really good beasts, and they make as much alive as an English bullock, and a good deal more than a foreign bullock. They can bring these beasts alive, and they are doing it now, and I believe the difference of freight appears, from evidence which has been given before this Committee, to be about 2 *l.* per bullock.

5429. It was more than that; 7 *l.* was what the last witness stated was the normal freight, though it was brought down occasionally by competition whilst they were trying to get the trade?—Make the difference 3 *l.* if you like. Then, it appears to me, why should they try now all they can and get steamers ready for the purpose, and do it every week, to bring them alive instead of dead? I believe we shall get American beasts alive in summer, and very likely dead meat in winter, because, when the bad weather comes, they cannot bring them over alive from America. When they are alive they make as much money as English bullocks and more than foreign bullocks. I have many times gone to my stand in the market, particularly in a middling dry season, and supposing that I have 300 beasts to sell, after I have picked out 50, all the rest were of a very middling sort, and were only fit to go to a certain trade. A great many of those beasts and sheep are sold, as I tell you, to go for 200 miles round London.

5430. Then, I suppose, that you yourself would say that the existing state of things could not be altered with regard to the foreign import if the town is to be properly supplied in the future without, as you have described, the market being glutted at one time and deficient at another?—I think that the foreign live import must continue. My opinion, and I give this as a practical man of large experience, is, that I believe that these measures would hurt nobody more than the English farmer. If you kill all the beast at Deptford and bring American meat, where is the market left for him? Now London is the market which the English farmer looks to to send his best beasts. I know a little about this business, because I hunt in the shires, and I know a great many farmers, and they all say that if they cannot send their beasts to the London market they have not a good market to go to. Now London rules the corn trade in England, and the London

Chairman—continued.

market rules the cattle trade too. All the local markets take their tone more or less from the London market. If you bring 7,000 dead carcases of beef into London, where is there room left for the English farmer to sell his beasts?

5431. You mean that it would practically diminish the demand in the English market as well?—Yes. The butcher does not put on a ticket when he sends you a joint of roasting-beef, "This is English beef"; but he gets the inferior meat into you if he can, and therefore he would not buy the English beasts if he could buy the others much cheaper.

5432. I understand that your objection to an entirely dead-meat trade is, that from the amount of dead meat that there might occasionally be to be sold, the market would be glutted, and prices would fall so low, that there would not be the inducement to send over meat from abroad?—Yes, in one way; and in the other way I say that you would shut the English farmer off from the market, because he could not send his meat to the best market.

5433. At the same time, if that had the effect of stopping the foreign import, the prices would rise again, would they not?—Yes, of course time would rectify that.

5434. You state that you think it is desirable that the regulations as to slaughter at the port should be relaxed?—Yes.

5435. Do you believe that we should return to those regulations that existed prior to the cattle plague breaking out here, with regard to scheduled and unscheduled countries, leaving the trade from the unscheduled countries free, and replacing the restrictions on the scheduled countries that existed before the Order in Council that was made on the outbreak of cattle plague?—I believe that would be the best.

5436. You would return to the original orders which allowed cattle from abroad to circulate freely through the country, as long as they came from an unscheduled country?—Yes, just the same as they were before the late outbreak of cattle plague in January.

5437. And you state that, because you believe that the import of foreign beasts is necessary for the supply here?—Yes, from sound countries.

5438. Has your attention been directed to the question of the cow-sheds in London?—Yes, a great deal.

5439. Do you agree with other witnesses in believing them to be hot-beds of disease, as they have been described?—I believe there is a constant danger from the cow-sheds, because, from the excessive way in which they feed their cows for the purpose of forcing the milk, they always have pleuro-pneumonia more or less. If a man has a diseased cow in his shed, he perhaps has this cow slaughtered; he is afraid to take it to market; but the other cows which stood next to the diseased one are allowed to go to market, and they can, of course, be taken into the country anywhere.

5440. You represent that whilst the Islington Market is free, and you can buy cattle there in order to send them into the country, pleuro-pneumonia is spread from the London cow-sheds in that way?—I think you have a chance of getting a great deal of it.

5441. Would you propose to prevent these sheds being kept in London, or how would you deal with them?—I think there is no occasion to

Mr. *Gebhardt.*

18 June 1877.

Mr. *Gebhardt.*

18 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

keep cows at all in London, because a great deal of the milk is brought in now from the country, and it must be much easier to bring milk in from the country than to bring all the hay and mangold wurzel to feed the cows with, and to take away all the manure.

5442. From the difficulties of inspecting and keeping any watch over those places where they are maintained in large towns, you think that they ought to be prohibited?—I think so.

5443. Because of their frequently being, as I understand you, the means of spreading the disease in the country?—Yes.

5444. Are we not liable also to get diseases spread from the Islington Market as long as the animals are circulating through it into the country?—I believe in that market, and now lately, we have been very free from foot-and-mouth disease; but at almost all other times there is foot-and-mouth disease in those lairs; and I consider that either English or foreign beasts, if they ever go to that market, should never go anywhere else excepting for killing purposes, because I think the great mischief is done by jobbing. If we have a bad trade a man comes and buys in this market, very rarely foreigners, but he buys English cattle; he will take, perhaps, 40 or 50 sheep, or 40 or 50 beasts, more or less; he can buy them worth the money, and he takes them to another market, say Romford, or Croydon, or Southall, or perhaps further off, for the sake of getting a few shillings profit. Those beasts almost always carry disease in cases where foot-and-mouth disease or pleuro-pneumonia exists. They have been in those lairs, and it is almost certain that they will have caught the disease if the disease is at all in the country. When I had beasts to sell in that market and I did not sell them on the Monday, but turned them out into those lairs, on the Thursday they showed signs of foot and-mouth disease. I believe, of course, that if the country is free from disease it would not matter so much; but it is very rarely that those sheds are free, and I believe that that market ought to be to all intents and purposes a market for fat cattle and not for stores.

5445. You would limit Islington, in fact, to being a fat-cattle market?—Yes.

5446. How would you regulate that the cattle should be circulated in the country, and yet be only sold for slaughter?—By having just the same regulations as are enforced with regard to cattle plague. Then nothing could leave the market without a killing license. The radius was then, of course, not so large as I would make it; but I do not see anything to prevent a man buying cattle or sheep, taking them to Plymouth or Wales, or anywhere by a killing license.

5447. You would allow of their free circulation, but you would so mark them or surround them with such penalties if they were not sold absolutely for killing as to limit it to a killing trade?—Yes, because the law would not very often be broken; I should say that ninety-nine out of a hundred that would be sold there would be sold for killing purposes. Supposing that a man sends his beasts from Leicester a hundred miles up to London, it would not pay another man to buy those beasts and take them back again; if he buys them, certainly he buys them for killing purposes.

5448. Then it practically does not pay a farmer to send his beast up to market and to take it back home, or take it to another market for sale?—A farmer does not do that. He sends his cattle or sheep to London, and says, "They must make the best price they can;" but a jobber says, "These beasts may be worth a few shillings more next Wednesday at Romford," or elsewhere, and he takes them there; and, perhaps, at those small places you have store beasts or sheep as well as fat cattle, and another man buys those animals and takes the disease home. We are not supposed to bring any beasts or sheep with disease, either foot-and-mouth or pleuro-pneumonia, to market, because they are killed at the water-side if there are any in the cargo.

5449. And you believe that in this way you would diminish the probability of the spread of disease in the country by making the Islington Market simply a fat stock market for killing, so that there would not be the chance of our English animals getting the disease in the lairs?—I believe that might be done.

5450. I suppose you would mark the animal, then, as they did at the time of the cattle-plague?—Yes; for instance, bullocks are very easily marked, because when a bullock is shown in a fair he has got long hair on his tail, and it is customary when we sell the beasts for killing purpose, to clip off those hairs, so that he would carry off the sign with him that he had been shown once before.

5451. Is there anything else which you would wish to represent to the Committee in your examination in chief?—With regard to foot-and-mouth disease, it was stated that Denmark was free from foot-and-mouth disease.

5452. One of the witnesses stated that it was free, and that they had had only one or two outbreaks of it in that country during the last few years. There was one case last year in which seven animals which came from Denmark were found to be affected with it, but that was the only case that was stated, I think?—We had this year one diseased cargo from Denmark, so that supposing Denmark is free from foot-and-mouth disease those beasts must have caught it on the journey, because when they came here they had foot-and-mouth disease, and they had to be reshipped and sent to Deptford.

5453. I think that was the cargo which was mentioned here by Count Danneskiold?—I was not here when he was examined.

5454. Upon that, I asked the Count whether the vessel had touched at any other port after embarking them from which she might have brought the disease?—That was on the 24th of February this year.

5455. Is that all that you wish to say with regard to that?—Yes.

Mr. *W. E. Forster.*

5456. I gather from your evidence that you deal rather more in sheep than you do in cattle?—No, I do not; but my cattle trade this year has been entirely stopped because of the importation being stopped. I used to deal very largely in cattle before the trade was interfered with.

5457. But, at the present time, owing to the existing regulations, you deal rather more in sheep than in cattle?—Yes, I have very few cattle now.

5458. I do not know whether you can give me any information upon this point, but have you ever formed any opinion as to whether, taking into

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

into account the animal food consumed in London, there is more mutton or more beef consumed?—I have not given much attention to that matter, but I should fancy that there is more beef consumed.

5459. As regards the weight of meat that comes from abroad, generally speaking, is there more mutton or more beef?—In the first part of the season, that is to say, from the 1st of January to the 1st of July, there is certainly more mutton. Since Germany and Holland have been scheduled the importation from those countries has been very small; in fact from Germany there has been none at all; so that I should say, certainly, in the first part of the year there is more mutton; and afterwards, when the Tonning beasts begin to come in, I should fancy (but I am only speaking from impression) that there is more beef.

5460. The Privy Council Returns for 1876, give 159,935 head as the number of foreign cattle brought into the London market, and 806,644 as the number of foreign sheep; can you give us any notion, as regards the number of pounds of meat, what would be the proportion as between the beasts and the sheep?—If you take the average weight of foreign sheep and the average weight of foreign bullocks, I should say that 12 sheep would be equal to one bullock; that is taking the bullock at 600 lbs. and the sheep at 50 lbs.

5461. In that case, as regards food, the cattle supply a much larger proportion of it than the sheep?—I believe so. I should reckon the beef at about double the mutton.

5462. Where do you get your foreign sheep from mainly?—The foreign sheep, say from the 1st of January to the 1st of July, almost all come from the centre of Germany, that is to say, Berlin, Magdeburg, Dresden, and then round to Bavaria, Wurtemberg, Baden-Baden, and the Rhenish provinces.

5463. They are generally of the merino breed, are they not?—They are generally of the merino breed, crossed now with English sheep.

5464. I suppose that, generally speaking, they would be smaller than the home animals that go into the London market?—Yes, the average weight of those sheep would be from 48 to 56 lbs.

5465. What is the average weight of English sheep?—The average weight of English sheep, if you take a Southdown, which is considerably the smallest, would be, perhaps, from 64 lbs to 72 lbs.; of course when we get to Lincolns and Gloucesters they go to any weight, say 160 lbs.

5466. Taking Table VII., at page 128, the proportion of sheep, which is 48 per cent. of the foreign animals imported, would be a great deal larger than the proportion that the weight of the sheep imported would bear to the total weight of the animals imported, would it not?—Yes.

5467. Going now to beasts, your Schleswig-Holstein beast is nearly as big as the average English animal, is he not?—No; there are two distinct breeds in Schleswig-Holstein; there are the store beasts, which they get from Jutland, which are small beasts; but what they call home-bred beasts are mostly bred from English stock, and they are heavier, and those beasts are in a great many instances, on an average, as heavy as English beasts.

5468. With regard to the dead meat from America, I suppose, from the answers which you

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

have given to the Chairman, you think that as yet we do not know enough about the trade to know whether it will be a great success or not?—No, I think not. I think the trade is too young, and there has not yet been experience enough to teach us whether it will last.

5469. That being a matter of opinion, I am going to ask you about the trade as it is. We were informed by a witness who had a good deal to do with the management of the trade, that about three bullocks went to produce a ton of American meat; do you agree with him as to that?—I believe that that is correct.

5470. Am I not right in supposing that, so far as the trade has yet been tried, about as much came in in the first three months of this year as has come in in any other three months?—The figures in these last three months are stronger than they have ever been before, I believe. I did not take the figures down, but I think I remember that they increased in almost every week.

5471. I have before me a return of all the dead meat for the first three months of this year, ending the 31st of March, and I suppose that includes not merely the American meat, but other forms of preserved meat, and so forth?—I have not the figures.

5472. The dead meat imported from the United States into London in those three months is stated to have been 55,251 cwt., including everything, salted and fresh; that is 2,762 tons, and that at three beasts to the ton, would be 8,286 beasts; assuming those figures to be correct, do you think that an import of 8,286 beasts into London for a quarter of a year, has any perceptible effect upon the consumption of London?—As it is all consumed in one place, I think of course that the effect of it would be to lower the price of meat considerably, as in fact it has done.

5473. You have heard of the proposals that have been put before this Committee, one of which is that all live cattle from the Continent should be prohibited; what effect do you think that such an order as that would have upon the price of food in London?—I think that it would make meat very dear indeed.

5474. Have you any idea, in your own mind, of what it would bring the prices to?—I think that it would be very presumptuous for me to offer an opinion, because it would raise the price all over England, of course. If London is the dearest market, the English stock would come here; but I believe if that was the case, it would cause a general rise all over the country.

5475. What are the foreign markets that mainly compete with London for foreign cattle?—I think that France would be a great consumer, particularly in the mutton line.

5476. France does not grow her own meat now, does she?—France has been always a large importer of German sheep.

5477. What difference in price in the Paris market, as compared with the London market, will divert a cargo of beasts or sheep to Paris instead of its coming to London?—A very trifling amount. In the case of merino sheep I should say that 1 *s.* or 2 *s.* a sheep would divert them to London instead of their going to Paris.

5478. And what is the case of a beast?—For a beast I should say that 10 *s.* or 1 *l.* a head would divert them.

5479. It is easier for the German sheep to get

Mr. *Gebhardt.*

18 June 1877.

Mr. *Gebhardt.*

18 June 1877.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

across the frontier into France than it is for Schleswig cattle to get there, I suppose?—The Schleswig cattle would go and supply the wants of Germany more than of France, because Germany is only an exporting country of beasts in the first six months of the year, and then they are principally stall-fed. It is now a fact that when the grass season commences, a great many Schleswig-Holstein beasts go into the interior of Germany, and even as far as the Rhenish provinces. Of course we cannot tell what effect it would have if they could not come to England, and whether they would not go more to France than they do now.

5480. You said, I think, that you did not expect that the half-frozen dead meat would come over from the Continent from Germany at any time?—No, I believe it would not pay.

5481. Why should it not pay from St. Petersburgh or the Russian ports?—I do not know. That is a matter to which I have never given any consideration; it is a question whether they have got any to send, and next, whether you would like to have them, because they would bring you the cattle plague.

5482. You mean, if those witnesses are right who think that dead meat would be as dangerous, in respect of cattle plague, as live cattle; but supposing that fear removed, every other condition would exist in Russia, would it not; there are a great number of cattle, and there is plenty of ice?—I cannot give any opinion about the Russian meat, because I have not any experience of it.

5483. Taking the regulations before the cattle plague order was issued, the regulations to which the Government might return after the present fear of the cattle plague is removed, what would you think would be the immediate effect of ordering all the foreign cattle to go to Deptford market?—The immediate effect would be that a great many would be compelled to go there this year, because people, of course, have not been prepared for this order, and they have increased their breeding and their grazing every year; and it always takes a time for trade to regulate itself. It might be, of course, a great blow for those people if such an order were to take effect without warning; and I believe, if this American meat were to continue on the top of it, it would be very disastrous, and an immense lot of money would be lost on the Continent, until they found other markets.

5484. You think that the effect would be that we should get the cattle this year, but that it would be at such a loss that we should not get them next year?—The supply would diminish every year. As the witness said the other day, if American meat can be sent here, and is sold at 6 *d.* per lb., it leaves a profit; and if it be true, as he stated, that their surplus would feed all England, then there would be no need of English or foreign beasts.

5485. Putting aside, at present, the effect of the import of American meat, what would be the effect of ordering the foreign cattle to be slaughtered at Deptford?—If all foreign cattle had to be slaughtered at Deptford, and they had to compete, as dead meat, with the American meat in the meat market, the loss to the foreign grazier would be so great that he would try to avoid this market as much as he could, and to find other sources which trade always will find. A man may go to market and lose one or two weeks; but then he will try to find other channels, and, if he could not find other channels for selling his beasts, he would produce less.

5486. Orders are sometimes obliged to be suddenly given for cargoes to come into Deptford, are they not?—Occasionally, when we have any disease detected, they go there; but that is only a single cargo, and that may be disposed of without a very severe loss.

5487. Is not that uncertainty whether they will be allowed to go to the Islington Market, or whether they will have to go to Deptford, a great inconvenience to the trade?—No, I think not; because if a foreigner puts diseased cattle or sheep on board, he does it with his eyes open, and takes the risk.

5488. I was not speaking of an order which may be issued with reference to what may be found out about his own cargo, but he is subject to considerable fluctuation, on account of what may happen in the countries from which he exports. For instance, was not the order which directed all the cargoes to go to Deptford issued almost suddenly, on the appearance of cattle-plague this year?—Yes.

5489. Is it not a very great inconvenience to be subject to that doubt as to whether you must slaughter your cattle at Deptford or whether you may take them to Islington?—I think the uncertainty is a great deal better than the state of things would be if you made a permanent affair of it. Cattle-plague, I hope, will never come here again, and if it had been treated properly it would not have come now. The veterinary surgeon at Hamburg has been dismissed by the Prussian Government for negligence of duty, and I believe that they will take such precautions that perhaps we may be safe from cattle plague. But as to the other diseases, I think we shall not be safe. Before they put sheep or cattle on board they are well examined; then, if a cargo of, say 400 or 1,000 beasts goes to Deptford, there is not such a glut, and they can be disposed of; but if they knew it was always permanent, they would try to find other channels, or they would breed less. That is my opinion and experience, because I am sorry to say that I have had experience of this when we have been obliged to go to Odam's Wharf, or to the Victoria Docks, or to Deptford, and the loss that has occurred there has been frightful sometimes.

5490. Would not the certainty of the trade and the removal of these fluctuations in a short time compensate you for the present disadvantage of sending them to Deptford?—Certainly not.

5491. Do you not think that the trade would get accustomed to the restrictions at Depford and adapt itself accordingly?—No, because whilst you have cattle at Deptford you cannot take them out, and you have only a certain class of customers, and those customers in a bad trade are not very fair customers; but you submit to their price because you have no other chance. In a very strong market they almost get them at their own price. I have known a man who could not a few years ago pay for an old cow at Deptford, and he can now tender a cheque for a thousand or two. At Deptford you keep out all the country buyers and all the small butchers, and the trade must be in the hands of large men; because, if a man goes to Deptford, he must have an extra slaughter-house, and he must have an extra

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

extra staff of men. He must either avoid the trade or he must go into it; and all the 200 mile customers cannot come there. I represent the trade not only in London but also very largely on the Continent, and they would rather submit to stringent regulations in England that if they send a diseased cargo they should pay the penalty than that the trade should be stopped altogether.

5492. I suppose that the population within the Metropolitan district is at least 4,000,000?—I believe it is.

5493. And you do not think that that is a sufficiently large market to be self-sufficing, as it were?—No, because we should be overburdened with a class of meat which we should have no outlet for. For instance, a little time ago we had 24,000 merinos in Deptford; if it had been warm weather those sheep could not have been sold, but it was cold weather, and the people from Manchester, Birmingham, Liverpool, Wales, and the South of England, came and killed those sheep at Deptford and took them away.

5494. I think I understood you in your evidence in chief to say that the inferior meat went off into the country?—A great deal of it does.

5495. I should have thought that there must have been a large population in London who would have been as willing as anybody in the country to buy that inferior meat?—Yes, but if you have got ten baskets of strawberries and only want one, you must let the others spoil. We might have done it before the American meat came, but as the American meat must be sold at any price after it has been here a day or two, the result must be that the market will be glutted.

5496. Have you any idea of what proportion of foreign beasts that come into the port of London go out alive from the metropoliton district?—I should say, from my experience (of course I will not talk of correct figures) that about half the supply of foreign beasts and sheep that go to Islington Market are distributed over the country. I could show by my books what I sell to country buyers.

5497. You have been a long time in the trade, have you not?—I have been in it for 40 years abroad and here.

5498. As an average, in making your calculations of profit and loss, how many days do you think that you have to keep the beasts before you get rid of them?—Beasts arrive mostly on the Saturday, but in rough weather perhaps they arrive on the Sunday, and if they can save the market they are sold on the Monday. It is very rarely that they are turned out or kept over, because I think it does not matter whether they are English or foreign beasts after they have once made a journey to a market and stood that market the sooner they are disposed of the better, because of the additional expense of their being in the lairs, and the risk of their getting foot-and-mouth disease; so that I as a rule hardly ever keep any beasts from one market day to the other, but sell them on the next market day after they arrive.

5499. Do more beasts or more sheep that come from abroad go into the country?—In the spring I should say that more sheep go into the country, but in the grass season we supply nearly all Kent and Surrey with beasts. I should fancy that there are very few butchers in Kent and Surrey, right down to the South Coast, who do not come and buy some of the foreign beasts. I should say the beasts would be more than the sheep in the grass season.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

5500. You are aware that one of the suggestions which has been made is that there should be greater freedom of import into London, but that the cordon should be continued, and that no animals should be allowed to be sent out of London; what do you think of that suggestion?—I think that that would be very injurious to all, because, as I have already stated, if a man happened to live just a mile beyond the radius he could not supply himself with the article which he required.

5501. Do you know when the Order in Council was issued this year drawing a cordon round London in consequence of the cattle plague?—In January.

5502. Therefore it has been in existence about five months?—Yes.

5503. What effect has it had upon the price of meat?—It has not had an effect upon the price of meat, because our meat has been kept down by the price of the American dead meat. A great many sheep, as I have already stated, have been taken away from London.

5504. You remember that in 1872 we had no American meat, and we had the cordon then; what effect had it at that time?—I think it made the meat very dear in those districts where they could not get it from London.

5505. What effect had it in London itself?—I remember that we had very heavy markets at times; the trade was uncertain, much more so than it is if they can go away; but I could not remember the price of meat.

5506. There was a cordon drawn round London for many months during the time that cattle plague was raging in 1865, was there not?—Yes.

5507. What was the effeet of it then?—I rather think that meat was dearer because the English beasts were short, and I think the importation was very large at that time; but I have not got the figures before me, and I should not like to speak positively upon that point.

Mr. *Wilbraham Egerton.*

5508. How long do you think that the cattle from the Continent, from Germany and from Holland, would be able to go on competing with the American meat?—That is a very difficult question to answer, because you see now the prices have got to such a height. When you have meat at 9 *d.* per lb., that means 6 *s.* a stone, which is the price of beef, and sheep are dearer. I think there is a great margin that prices may be lowered, and if the prices gradually went down the prices of English stock would gradually go down to the prices of the foreigners. I do not think you could come to a definite conclusion about it.

5509. What is the lowest price at which it would pay the foreigner to send his meat here in any shape?—My recollection is, that when cattle were first imported from the Continent the price of English meat and foreign meat was under 6 *d.* per lb. sinking the offal. What we now sell for 6 *s.* we sold then for 4 *s.*, and I have not the slightest doubt that, by an increased importation of American meat, the price would be gradually reduced; but they would keep on sending as long as they found a fair market.

5510. You assumed in one of your answers, that

Mr. *Gebhardt.*

18 June 1877.

Mr. *Gebhardt.*

18 June 1877.

Mr. *Wilbraham Egerton*—continued.

that Germany and those other European countries would go on sending the same amount of meat as they do now, in addition to the American meat; on the contrary, would not the effect of a constant supply of American meat be gradually to reduce the quantity of meat coming from the Continent, so that there would not be the glut to which you alluded in your answer to the Chairman?—If you do this gradually, of course the trade will regulate itself.

5511. Would not the London market eventually be much better supplied, as you suggest, by American dead meat in winter, and by American live animals and dead meat in summer, whichever the Americans choose to send, than it has been by the foreign meat up to the present year?—But I do not see why you should throw a very good food away which has now stood the test for 35 years. The foreign importation has lasted 35 years, while you are going to calculate on a fresh trade which has only existed for a year.

5512. But you admit that the American meat itself is better than the foreign meat, and that the live American animals fetch more than the foreign animals?—Yes.

5513. Then there can be no objection, if we can get American meat, to our doing away with the inferior foreign meat?—That is not the reason why we should do so, because everybody is not a rich man, and you want to feed the poor as well as the rich; and if you can produce an article which is less per pound, the poor man will buy it, while, if you have nothing but a superior article, perhaps he could not afford to buy it.

5514. Then your opinion is that unless the animals came alive from the Continent there would be no more dead-meat trade from the Continent?—No, I believe not; I believe they would find other means to get rid of their stock, because the expense and risk which I see in the dead-meat trade would prevent their sending it.

5515. You do not think that the Germans would go to the expense of fitting up vessels for the purpose of the dead-meat trade, with the possibility of their being eventually beaten by the American competition in the same trade?—I think that, so long as they could find an outlet for their live stock in any other way, or could utilize their land for any other purpose, they could not breed and fatten cattle to be sent here in a dead state.

5516. I suppose that the value of land and of live stock in the north of Germany has increased very much in the last 15 years, has it not?—It has doubled.

5517. With regard to slaughtering the animals at Deptford, are you aware whether at present the offal is taken from Deptford to the towns in the north?—In the cold weather, such as we had this winter and in the spring, they have taken the offal away. A witness who will probably be examined hereafter, will tell you that he has taken it to Wales; and he stated last week that a lot of his offal was spoiled, and he could not take any more; it will not do in hot weather.

5518. Do you state of your own knowledge that the offal will spoil if it is sent in the hot season?—Yes, that is of my own knowledge.

5519. Do butchers ever take cattle from the Metropolitan Market at present, and slaughter them at the Deptford Market?—Never, to my knowledge.

5520. Do you consider that slaughtering cattle at Deptford is more expensive than slaughtering them on the premises of the butcher?—Yes; because he is obliged to have an extra staff and an extra slaughter-house.

Mr. *Wilbraham Egerton*—continued.

5521. You have spoken about the advisability of separating the fat animals from those animals which might be bought as store animals; how would you propose to create a fresh market where store animals could be bought in London?—You do not want to buy store animals in London at all; and very few are bought in London at present. I think that very few men would run the risk of buying store animals in the London market, unless they desired to get the complaint.

5522. You think that it would be advisable that all the animals in the Islington Market, as in the Deptford Market, should go out slaughtered, or marked for slaughter, within a certain period?—That is my opinion.

Mr. *Torr.*

5523. Do you deal at all at Deptford as well as at Islington?—Yes.

5524. Do you find a marked difference in the two markets?—Yes, a great difference.

5525. In what way?—In the Islington Market I have got the whole trade, and there is competition; at Deptford I am reduced to a few buyers, who lay themselves open for their trade.

5526. You do not do anything in dead meat at all, do you?—I do not.

5527. And you have a very large trade in this live stock that is imported from abroad?—Yes.

5528. Have you ever imported anything from America or Canada?—I have not.

5529. Your entire business is in the import of live stock from the Continent?—Yes.

5530. Then if, as has been suggested, the stock from the Continent, or from Germany and Holstein, should come in the shape of dead meat instead of as live animals, your trade would be completely destroyed?—That does not follow. I do not believe that I should do it, but if I meant to do it the same trade would come to me, because if I established a dead-meat trade the same connection would come to me as if I had a live-stock trade.

5531. But at present you say that you do not do anything in the dead-meat trade?—No, I do not.

5532. Your chief objection to the dead meat coming from America is to the imperfect condition in which it comes, is it not?—In which some of it comes.

5533. You admit that the meat itself is a very superior class of meat?—A great deal of it is very good meat; I have seen inferior, but the greater part of it is good.

5534. You seem to have an opinion that it will not increase, owing to the imperfect condition in which it comes?—No; I said that I believe, from what I have seen of the importation, that if they bring it in large lots in one cargo it comes in a bad state, and small consignments come in a good state; so that it appears to me that it is a want of space, and of course a question of expense.

5535. But I presume your opinion would change, supposing that by any improved mode of transit that beef could be brought in a sound and fresh state to this market?—I believe that it could,

Mr. *Torr*—continued.

could, because if they brought it sound occasionally they might bring it sound again.

5536. It might all be brought in as good a state as the small specimens that you have seen, might it not?—It might be possible if they had space enough.

5537. If all the dead meat that comes from America came in as good and sound a condition as the small quantities which you admit have come in that good condition, it would then be a more formidable rival to your foreign German beef than it is now, would it not?—Of course it would.

5538. And it would form a more efficient supply for the London market?—Yes.

5539. Rendering you more independent of the German supply?—Yes.

Mr. *Jacob Bright.*

5540. Do I correctly understand that all the cattle from the scheduled countries for London go to Deptford for slaughter?—Yes.

5541. There is no other place in the country for London but Deptford?—No, no other place.

5542. How soon must the cattle be slaughtered when they go to Deptford; must they be slaughtered immediately?—I think there is a law that they must be slaughtered within 10 days, but they are always slaughtered as soon as they can find a sale.

5543. Is there any given time when they must be slaughtered?—Yes, I believe they must be slaughtered in 10 days, but I am not quite certain whether it is so or not.

5544. You seem to have a strong opinion that to compel the cattle to be slaughtered at Deptford must reduce the trade?—Yes, certainly.

5545. Can you make it clear how it would lessen the trade; is it simply because it cannot wait for a market?—No, it is because it would not realise the good price which it would realise in an open market. Therefore, if a man gets less for his stock, he will send less.

5546. But it is not very clear to my mind how it is that there is not an open market; how is it?—You do not get the men from the country who take it away from London, and you do not get the retail butcher.

5547. Why not?—Because the man from the country cannot buy it, because he wants his stock home alive; and the retail butcher cannnot do it on account of the expense. It would not pay him to have a slaughter-house at home, and a slaughter-house at Deptford, and a double staff, so that he is actually prohibited from doing it.

5548. So that it creates a sort of monopoly?—Yes.

5549. In addition to that he cannot wait for a market, and the meat must be consumed, and that must be a reason why prices are sometimes driven down?—Yes.

5550. Then you have a strong opinion that where you compel cattle to be slaughtered you must necessarily greatly diminish the trade?—Yes; the price must be reduced, and of course it would not pay the sender, and he would try to avoid a market where he thinks he has no fair chance.

5551. And therefore if any such regulation as that were enforced in this country it would, of necessity, deprive the people of this country of much meat which they would otherwise have?—Yes.

Mr. *Assheton.*

5552. You gave an answer on Friday that rather puzzled me; I understood you to say, when you were talking about foot-and-mouth disease, that if that disease were stamped out of the country, you thought that under the conditions of this climate, the disease would always break out again; was that what you said?—I do not exactly say that it would do so under the conditions of this climate; I believe it is a disease that is liable to break out spontaneously in any country.

5553. Can you then, in your own mind, at all account for its never, so far as we are aware, having broken out in this country previously to 1839?—No, that is impossible for me to account for, or anybody else, I think, because it is a disease that might have been prevalent under another name; but of course I am not at all in a position to give an opinion as to that.

5554. I understand you, then, to think that there is something in the soil which will breed foot-and-mouth disease; that is your idea, is it?—My idea and experience is that it will appear in cattle when they have travelled, and after they have been sent from a distant country, even store cattle. I speak now from my own experience; I have bought stores at a fair which were apparently sound and healthy; I have taken them home, and after some time, they not having been in contact with any other cattle after I bought them, foot-and-mouth disease has appeared. So far as I know, there might be, as the Chairman said the other day, a dog crossing the fields, or something of that kind; but otherwise they had not been in contact with any other cattle, and the disease broke out spontaneously.

5555. I presume that you drove them along the high road?—Of course I did; they came home by rail, and after leaving the railway they had to go a certain distance home.

5556. Cannot you conceive the possibility of their having caught the disease on the high road, as well as of their having bred it out by themselves?—Of course that may be.

5557. But you can offer no theory why the disease should have appeared in 1839, and should never have appeared before?—I cannot give an opinion about that, and I suppose nobody else can.

5558. As a matter of fact, in rough weather at sea are cattle sea-sick?—I do not believe they are.

5559. Will they eat and drink?—They will not eat so well; I have seen a great many come across, but I have never seen any sick.

5560. But they get off their feed, do they not, in rough weather?—Yes, naturally; and so would any other animal if you took him, not across the sea, but away from his own food; he will not feed for the first 12 hours, but the second day he is sure to feed. I have seen them myself, because I have been across myself many times with cattle that have been coming over.

5561. Have you ever been many days at sea with cattle?—I have never been longer at sea with cattle than three days, from Germany to London.

Mr. *Mundella.*

5562. Did I correctly understand you to say that France was a competitor with us for German meat?—Yes.

Mr. *Gebhardt.*

18 June 1877.

Mr. *Mundella*—continued.

5563. And that the tendency would be, in your opinion, if meat had to be slaughtered at the port of entry, that it would become cheaper in France and dearer in England?—That is so, because the supply would go to France and would not come here.

5564. Does not France derive a good deal of its supply from Switzerland?—I think not. There may be some part of France that may get some bullocks from Switzerland, but I think not many; not to my knowledge.

5565. Are you aware that the Americans are making great efforts to bring the beasts over alive?—I am.

5566. And that they have succeeded to some extent?—To a great extent. There are some here to-day.

5567. Do you know that some of them have realised very high prices in this market?—Yes, very high prices.

5568. What prices have you known?—I have not sold them myself, but I know that some of them have made from 30 *l.* to 40 *l.*

5569. Should you be surprised to hear that some of them have fetched 50 *l.*?—No; I have not been in the trade, but I have been told that they were extraordinarily fine cattle.

5570. You stated in your opening evidence that American meat realised the first day 7 *d.*, the second day 4 *d.*, the third day 2 *d.*, and that the balance was destroyed on the fourth day; I suppose that that is the reason why the importation of dead meat will always be a difficulty, inasmuch as it will be a fluctuating market, and the consignor cannot tell what price he will realise for his consignment?—No; it is an uncertain trade.

5571. Whereas the live cattle trade is a regular and a tolerably certain trade?—Yes.

5572. That is naturally the reason why everybody will prefer sending live cattle to sending dead meat, is it not?—Yes.

5573. Supposing that all the cattle that came into the port of London were to be slaughtered at Deptford, what effect would it have upon the inland markets at the great centres of industry, such as Birmingham and Sheffield, and those places?—The effect would be that those places, which are now great consumers, could not get that class of meat which they require, and they would be obliged to buy the English meat, which is comparatively dearer, which makes more money; and perhaps a great many of them would go without meat, not having the cheaper food at their market.

5574. You mean to say, in fact, that it would make the price dearer?—Yes, it would make the price dearer in the country and cheaper in London.

5575. It would make it cheaper in London for the time?—Yes.

5576. But that cheapness in London would gradually disappear, I presume, in consequence of the meat coming to an unremunerative market for the grower?—Yes, that is it.

5577. Meat would be cheaper in Germany and France and Belgium, and dearer in London, in fact, in England; is that your opinion?—The trade would regulate itself. If a man could make a better price in Germany or in France than in England, then he would not come here.

5578. And if he did his trade at less risk there than here he would not come here?—That is so.

Mr. *Mundella*—continued.

5579. The greatest element in trade is that a man can calculate on a profit, is not that so?—That is so.

5580. And there is nothing so inimical to the progress of trade as uncertainty in price?—There is nothing so bad.

Mr. *Ritchie.*

5581. I think you said just now, in answer to the honourable Member on my right, that the effect of slaughtering at the place of debarkation would be to make the meat dear in the country and cheap in London?—Yes.

5582. If meat were cheap in London, would it not be sent into the country in a dead state?—It could not in warm weather.

5583. Do you mean to say that there could not be appliances for taking it down as far as Birmingham or Sheffield?—The proof of it is that they do not do it.

5584. Supposing that it were cheap in London, would it not be quite possible to meet the demand in Birmingham and Sheffield by sending the dead meat down there if it were to be had cheap?—No; because by the time they got the meat there it would be spoiled.

5585. By the time they got the meat to Birmingham?—Yes, because, if you kill the meat to-day, it could not get to Birmingham till to-morrow.

5586. Do they not bring dead meat up from Aberdeen?—Yes, they do; but that is quite different. In Aberdeen, first of all, it is much colder, and very little comes from Aberdeen in summer.

5587. It may be colder in Aberdeen, but it has to go through a warmer climate before it comes to London, has it not?—Yes, but I tell you very little does come from Aberdeen to London in hot weather.

5588. Do you not think that appliances would soon be found, if meat were cheap in London, for taking it down into the country, if it were wanted there?—Yes, but the question is, how long the meat would be cheap in London.

5589. I am assuming that the slaughtering of cattle at Deptford would make meat cheaper in London and dearer in the country?—I have stated that I believe that, if they were obliged to go to Deptford, the price would be so bad, that presently they would cease sending. It is like Billingsgate; you might get a glut of fish one day and buy them at any price, and the next week, perhaps, you have to pay double or three times as much.

5590. You said, I think, that it would render meat cheap in France and dear in England, if you had to slaughter it at the port of debarkation?—I did not exactly say that; I said that if they found a better market in France, and without restrictions, they would send there instead of coming here; and ultimately, by cutting off the supply by restrictions, you would then, perhaps, raise the price of meat in England.

5591. You said, I think, that if the meat had to be slaughtered at Deptford, one of the effects would be to divert the meat from coming here, and to send it to some other market?—Yes.

5592. On the Continent, I presume?—Yes.

5593. But if the meat which at present comes here were to be diverted to some other market on the Continent, would it not very much diminish the value of that meat in the market to which

Mr. *Ritchie*—continued.

which it was diverted?—No, it would not all go to one market, it would be distributed.

5594. Do you not think that if the whole supply that we get from the Continent now were diverted to continental markets it would lower the price in those markets?—I said that if you killed the beasts or sheep at Deptford you would diminish the supply to this country; I do not say that it would cease entirely; they would find other markets to take part of their supply to.

5595. You think that it would still come here?—It might. Of course it is impossible for me to prophecy what would happen; but I take it, as a matter of common sense, that the trade would find its own level. If a man finds that one market does not pay him he tries to find another market; and if he found that the price rose again in England he might come here again, because he has always the option of going wherever he likes.

5596. If he finds that by diverting it to some market out there it reduces the price below that which he can get in England, of course he would come back to England?—Certainly.

5597. Was it not one of your objections to slaughtering at Deptford that it would diminish the price, because it would diminish the number of buyers?—Yes.

5598. Do you not think that if all the cattle had to come to Deptford the buyers would go there in larger numbers than they go now, when only certain quantities have to be slaughtered?—No, I think not, because you cannot carry on a large trade in two different places; the expense would be so enormous to keep a staff of men at home and a staff of men there, and an extra slaughterhouse, and every thing. That has been proved by those men who go to Deptford. A great many men never go there; a butcher the other day, Mr. Lyon, said that he had never been to Deptford yet, because it would not pay him on account of the expense.

5599. I can easily understand that where it was an erratic sort of market a man would not go there; but if the market were diverted entirely there for importation from the Continent, would it not be worth while for men to go there who do not go there now?—It might be, but it is a trade which would be attended with great risk. There is such an uncertain trade in the dead market, having the American meat to contend with, that the whole trade would be ruined. If the man who sends the beasts found that this market did not suit him he would not come.

5600. It is all very well to make that statement, but I am taking you into one of the reasons that you give for that market not being suitable, that reason being that there were few buyers there; where a market is comparatively a small market and an erratic market, a few buyers might go there; but if it were a large market where all the meat went to, would not a great many more buyers go there?—They might.

5601. So that possibly so far as that objection is concerned, it might be met?—It might.

5602. You said that one of your reasons for objecting to the Deptford market was, that it would diminish the price, because the beasts could not be removed without being slaughtered. I understood you to suggest that the live animals should be allowed to come to the London market, but that they should not be allowed to leave except for the purpose of being slaughtered?—Yes, wherever you take them to.

Mr. *Ritchie*—continued.

5603. Would not that objection equally apply to the state of things when they would be sent to market, and could not be removed without being sold for slaughter?—No, that would be no objection at all, because there are plenty of buyers to buy them, and to take them all over the country.

5604. I understood you to say that you would draw a cordon?—No; I said that wherever they go to, they should go for killing purposes.

5605. I understood you to say that a certain cordon should be drawn, past which the cattle should not go; and then you went on to say that you would draw the cordon much larger, probably, than it was drawn before?—I do not recollect saying anything of the sort. I said distinctly that the Islington Market should be a market only for fat animals, and that they should be obliged, under a killing license, to go to wherever they were sold, but they should not be exposed again for sale in any other country market.

5606. How far from London do you think that live animals would be taken if they were sold only for slaughtering purposes in the London market?—Just as they were taken before the last Order in Council in January. As I have already stated, we supply to within a distance of about 200 miles round London; for instance, I put Liverpool at one extreme and Plymouth at the other extreme; if I said "radius," I meant "distance."

5607. That may, perhaps, account for the misunderstanding?—I meant to say that when a man wants foreign beasts for killing purposes, let him come here and buy them and kill them.

5608. Do men come up to the London market to take beasts down as far as Liverpool for slaughtering purposes?—Yes, lots every week, particularly sheep; and any amount of beasts we used to sell to Plymouth.

5609. Another objection which you have to Deptford is, because if all the meat had to be slaughtered there, there would be a difficulty in regulating the supply of meat into the market, and you might have a glut at some times and a scarcity at other times; did I correctly understand you to say that?—That is so.

5610. I understood you also to say that cattle were allowed to be kept for ten days at the Deptford Market before being slaughtered?—I believe that that is the regulation, but I am not quite certain about it.

5611. Do you not think that if a margin of ten days were allowed before cattle were obliged to be killed, with all our telegraphic facilities, by the time the trade had continued any length of time, that difficulty might be overcome, and that the market might be regulated?—No.

5612. Not by our telegraphic facilities and our being able to keep the beasts alive for ten days?—No, it has nothing to do with it. You could not stop supplies. Take Tonning, for instance; they begin and send steamers over every week, and they come whether the market is bad or good, and they bring their regular supplies and risk the market; and, in fact, if they will trade to this country they must get rid of their supplies, because they have not found another market.

5613. I understood, I do not know whether it was from you or from another witness, that there was a certain point at which the exporter had to make up his mind, according to the selling prices in

Mr. *Gebhardt.*

18 June 1877.

Mr. *Gebhardt.*

18 June 1877.

Mr. *Ritchie*—continued.

in the London market or in the Paris market, as to whether he should send his cattle to London or to Paris?—That does not refer to Schleswig Holstein; that refers to the German sheep that go to France; but the point would be Mayence or Cologne; that would not affect the Schleswig Holstein beasts at all.

5614. As far as that was concerned then they could be regulated?—That could be regulated.

5615. And you do not think that the market for Schleswig Holstein cattle could be regulated even with the facilities for keeping them alive ten days at Deptford?—No, a man would be very silly to do so, because the waste of a bullock after the journey would be so serious that he would rather kill him than keep him alive to waste him. It is not likely that if a bullock comes out of a grass field and is put down at Deptford, that bullock could maintain its weight and condition. I say as a practical man that it cannot.

5616. My contention is rather that a great many of them would probably not come until they were sent for by telegraph?—One could not carry on a trade like that; it is a moral impossibility.

5617. With reference to the question of prohibiting the importation of live animals altogether, you think that if live animals were prohibited, we should not get dead meat from the Continent at all?—No, I think that as long as they could find any other market they would not come here.

5618. It is a matter of pounds, shillings, and pence?—It is a matter of experience; but taking it for granted that they would go into this ice question, it has never been stated before this Committee that prime American meat of first-rate quality stands the journey much better than middling meat; because if you have a beast which weighs 100 stone or 800 pounds, of course that is a prime bullock; that meat is thick and well set, and will stand the journey much better. A great deal of the foreign meat would weigh 500 pounds instead of 800 pounds, and consequently the meat is thin; the flanks and the sides are very thin. The great experience has been that the American meat that has been condemned has been of rather an inferior quality, so that it would not stand the journey so well. I believe that the first difficulty and expense would be to procure ice abroad, and another great difficulty would be, that it is proved, that offal could not be sent by this process. What would the people in Tonning, where there are about 3,000 inhabitants, do with the offal of 2,000 beasts and 3,000 or 4,000 sheep a week? That offal would be useless. You say that they might adopt an ice process, how would that thin plain meat arrive here compared to fat stout beef? It would very often be in such a condition that it could not be sold at all.

5619. You think that there are two difficulties; one difficulty being the question of the offal which you think could not be brought?—I am certain that it could not.

5620. And the other being that the meat is of such quality that it would not stand the journey so well as the American meat?—That is it; and then there is the expense of the ice.

5621. In your opinion, then, I presume that this meat when it arrived here, even if it were in fair condition, would probably not be worth so much per pound as the American meat is now, because it would not be of such good quality?—It would not.

Mr. *Ritchie*—continued.

5622. Of course, in your opinion, the value of the dead meat here would not be so much per pound as the value of the live animals?—Nothing like it.

5623. So that although the mere carriage of the meat might be a little less dead than alive; yet, seeing that it would not be worth so much per pound, the cost would be very much greater to the shipper?—Yes; but I am not certain that the cost is higher from Tonning for live meat than for dead meat.

5624. Even if we were to assume that it were less, the American would still have to deduct the difference in the value of his meat, dead or alive in this market?—He would.

5625. Do you know what the proportion of the live and dead meat which is imported into London is?—No; I have not gone into the figures.

5626. You do not know how much the supply of dead meat would have to be increased to make up for the stoppage of the live meat?—No, it is a matter of calculation, but I do not know.

5627. You spoke about the cow-sheds; you object, I understand, to their being in London, because the forcing of milk produces pleuro-pneumonia?—Very often it does.

5628. Do they not force milk in the country as well as in London?—First of all, in the country they rely more upon natural food; and I do not believe that a man would send a diseased cow up to London out of the country; I think he would dispose of it in some way or other, or kill it.

5629. He would probably send it to the market where he would realise the most for it?—If a diseased cow came into London and could not go out again except for killing purposes, that cow could not do any harm; but when the seed of pleuro-pneumonia is in the cow, but not developed, that cow might, under the present system, go and be sold, and travel over the country, and do a lot of mischief.

5630. Do you know whether there is any difference between the quality of the London milk and the quality of the country milk?—I should say that the country milk must be much the better, because the cows have more natural food.

5531. Do you know of your own knowledge anything about the relative qualities of the two milks?—Yes; last week we dealt with a London dairy, and now we deal with the Aylesbury dairy, and I find the milk a great deal superior. I heard that quite accidentally last week.

5632. Does it keep as long as the London milk?—I do not know how long it keeps, but we have it every day, and it is very good, and that, I suppose, is a pretty good test at this time of year.

Mr. *King Harman.*

5633. You say that if the cattle were slaughtered at Deptford it would raise the price of meat through the country, and especially at Birmingham and the different large towns?—Yes.

5634. As a matter of fact, since foreign cattle have had to be slaughtered at Deptford, has the price been raised in Birmingham and the different large towns?—The foreign cattle which have been

Mr. *King Harman*—continued.

been slaughtered at Deptford have been very few because they have not come.

5635. Whether there have been few or many, has the price been raised?—Of course it has; if it had not been raised it would have been cheaper.

5636. Has it not, as a matter of fact, been actually cheaper?—No, I think not.

5637. Has it been dearer?—I could not tell you, because I do not deal in Birmingham.

5638. You have given the Committee evidence to the effect that if the foreign cattle are obliged to be slaughtered at Deptford, the result of that will be that the price of beef will be raised in the country, and especially in the large towns, amongst which you specified Birmingham; I ask you, as an absolute fact, whether the price of beef has been raised in Birmingham since the Order directing foreign cattle to be slaughtered at Deptford?—The foreign cattle, at this time of the year, which would have been slaughtered at Deptford, have been very few; but the experience would commence next month, when the great supply from the Continent commences. We have, of course, not had the experience of it yet, except in the last outbreak, when we were compelled to go to Odam's Wharf, or to Deptford; but next month you will see the effect, and, if the cattle cannot go to those towns, the effect will be very serious. I am speaking principally of the grass season, which commences next month, and lasts until the end of the year; and you will find that, if the Schleswig-Holstein cattle have all to go to Deptford, the price of meat in the country will be very seriously raised.

5639. Although it has not risen at all?—because the time for the importation has not yet arrived.

5640. I thought that your information to the Committee was that the stall-fed cattle had been coming in from Southern Germany for the last three months?—No; I said they had been stopped.

5641. But, if they had not been stopped, the stall-feds would have been coming from the Rhenish provinces and from Southern Germany?—But I showed from the figures that there are much fewer in those six months than there are in the grass seasons.

5642. Allowing that you showed that a considerable quantity did come in, quite enough to make a marked difference in the price, that difference would have been shown by the stoppage of the stall-feds; but that does not seem to have occurred?—We had a new supply; this has partly been counteracted by the American supply, and I believe that if the American supply had not come meat would have been much dearer. I can only answer the question as I hear, because I do not deal in Manchester and Liverpool and those places; but I am told that meat is dearer there than it is in London. Of course, I cannot give that in evidence, but it is only a statement.

5643. Have you never heard that that is very frequently the case whether there are restrictions at Deptford or not?—It might be so occasionally; but as long as there is a fair market, trade will regulate itself.

5644. Should you be surprised to hear that prime meat is frequently dearer in Manchester than it is London?—I know it is.

Mr. *King Harman*—continued.

Mr. *Gebhardt.*

18 June 1877.

5645. Then that is not in consequence of the slaughter of cattle at Deptford?—No; but when we get a large supply in the London market, we have all these buyers from every part of England; whereas if you have the cattle at Deptford they cannot buy them, and that meat must be slaughtered there, and it will go to the dead-meat market, and you do not hear of people coming from Manchester or Liverpool to buy this dead meat.

5646. At the same time you do not hear of the price of meat being raised in Manchester or Liverpool in consequence of it, do you?—I have been told that meat is dearer there than it is in London; and, on the other hand, the great supply of American meat which has come into Manchester or Liverpool has counteracted it.

5647. Then your evidence is that, supposing one branch of the cattle supply was stopped, and another did not come in, meat would be dearer than it is at present?—No doubt.

5648. That, I think, we could have found out for ourselves. You say that in the ordinary state of affairs the small buyers come in and take a great deal of inferior cattle down to the mining districts?—No, I did not say so. I said that the country buyers came in there, and at Deptford we lose the country buyers, and we lose the retail butchers from London.

5649. Did you not say that men came from a considerable distance and took inferior cattle down to the mining and manufacturing districts?—Yes, I did say so.

5650. Is it your experience that the miners and the people in the manufacturing districts are in the habit of preferring inferior beef to good beef?—My experience is that the labouring classes cannot give so much money for their meat as the richer classes, and therefore they buy the cheaper article.

5651. Have you ever heard it stated that in the manufacturing districts, until quite lately, one of the great difficulties of the butchers was to dispose of the inferior joints, because the populace of the large towns would not buy them?—I did not hear so, but I can prove, if my evidence is worth anything, what is practically the case: that I have sold generally to those butchers who come from the manufacturing and the mining districts the inferior class of animals, and that I could show by figures, if my evidence is to be believed. I tell you that they buy a great deal of the glut of the market; when I say "inferior," it is good meat, but it is merino sheep.

Chairman.

5652. What I understood another witness from Manchester to state here before was, that the manufacturing districts preferred the foreign sheep because it was a lean animal, a smaller animal with smaller joints, and they got more meat for their money?—Yes; but we make less money if we sell them.

5653. The foreign sheep, of which you are a large importer, go into the manufacturing districts on that account as against the home sheep, which are too large, and too fat, for the consumers?—Yes.

Mr. *King Harman.*

5654. I understand that to be so as regards sheep; do you consider it so as regards cattle?

Mr. *Gebhardt.*

18 June 1877.

Mr. *King Harman*—continued.

—When I talk of inferior cattle, they are good sound healthy animals, but they are not so full of flesh and fat as your best English beasts are. If, for argument sake, I sell a foreign bullock at 7 *d.* per pound, the English bullock would be worth 9 *d.* per pound; that is 2 *d.* per pound difference; this butcher who buys the foreign bullock can send his meat to those places which I have mentioned; this meat, of course, is less per pound than the English meat, and so long as you allow this meat to reach him alive he can have it; but if he cannot get it alive he cannot get it at all.

5655. Why cannot he get it dead?—Because it will not keep; at this time of the year, in hot weather, do you think that a man would come here and slaughter his beasts or sheep in Deptford Market and take it over to Wales?

5656. I do not suppose he would; but I think the buyer at Deptford might send it, certainly, to either Sheffield or Birmingham?—He would not.

5657. He has never tried?—I beg you pardon, he has tried.

5658. Should you be surprised to hear that the owners of fat stock in the west of Ireland are, and have been for some time, in doubt whether it would not pay them better to slaughter on their own premises, and to send up the carcases to Dublin, than to send up live stock?—They may have thought so, but I think they had better let well alone; it remains to be proved, at any rate, whether it would answer.

5659. You say that you would recommend that the restrictions should be so far relaxed that foreign dealers should bring in their stock, and that they would be willing to submit to a heavy penalty if they brought in infected cattle?—I did not say so; I believe I stated that a foreigner cannot bring in diseased stock at all, because by the present regulations, when they arrive, if any animal has any disease about it, the whole cargo is detained and slaughtered at the water side. I stated that I considered that not only the butchers, but all the dealers, should not buy beasts, or sheep, in Islington Market except for killing purposes, and that they should not be shown in other fairs or markets; because I believe that these middlemen and jobbers do a great deal more harm by carrying disease about than any other class of buyers. I say that what goes to the Islington Market goes, to all intents and purposes, to a fat market for killing purposes; and if a man knows that he can send no stores there without their being killed, he will not send them there; and it is very rarely that a man does send them there; I have known sometimes, when trade is bad, when a beast may be worth more for keeping purposes than for killing half fat, a man may say, "I will buy these beasts and take them to a small country market;" he takes the disease to the market, and it is carried about the country; that is a fact which has been proved many times.

5660. I think you were speaking about bringing cattle into the country from foreign ports, and you stated that if foreign dealers shipped diseased cattle they would be perfectly willing to submit to any penalty for doing so?—If they had to submit to a loss of 2 *l.* or 3 *l.* a bullock, or 4 *s.* or 5 *s.* a sheep, that is a heavy penalty. If a cargo comes here with, say, 400 beasts from Tonning, very likely belonging to 100 different

Mr. *King Harman*—continued.

people, the inspection and the examinations there are so severe, that when you look to the returns hardly any cargoes have been detained on account of foot-and-mouth disease or pleuro-pneumonia. Occasionally there has been such a case when there is stress of weather, as we have known it, and the beasts or sheep, or a whole cargo have arrived, some of the animals having symptoms of foot-and-mouth disease, but then the whole cargo has been detained. It is the interest of the exporter not to put diseased animals on board; but the veterinary surgeon at Hamburg has been dismissed by the Prussian government, as I tell you, because he did not do his duty.

5661. Still he did not do his duty, and the cattle plague came?—He did not do his duty, and the cattle plague came.

5662. In point of fact, the whole of the flocks and herds of England are at the mercy of the inspector at any German port, are they not?—No, because after the cattle arrive here they have to undergo quarantine, and then they are inspected by English inspectors; so that if any outbreak of disease happens by the time these cattle are on board, which is generally 48 hours, then there is 12 hours quarantine, which is generally extended; you may almost say that it is three days. Then the cattle are examined here very strictly, and if the inspector detects any disease the whole cargo is detained and slaughtered. So that you do not rely upon a foreign inspector, but you rely upon your own inspector.

Mr. *Elliot.*

5663. You said on Friday, I think, that many of the foreign cattle are used for ploughing and other farming purposes?—Yes, that is in Prussia and Bavaria and the middle part of Germany.

5664. Are they afterwards sent over here for butchering purposes?—They used to come here after being fattened, and they were sold here for butchering purposes.

5665. They are generally second class cattle, are they not?—They are old cattle; they are very fat, but of course they would not make anything like so much as the English cattle.

5666. Not so much as the Holstein cattle?—I do not know; they are very good meat because they are not so very old. The estates there are mostly owned by noblemen; they have large estates, and they renew their stock every one or two years; so that the oxen would not be very old, perhaps five or six years old.

5667. Do you think there are more cattle in the country now than there were in 1865, before the rinderpest?—I cannot tell you.

5668. If we got the American meat very cheaply into the London market continuously, do you not think that the poorer people would prefer taking that to taking the offal?—That all depends upon what price the poor man could afford to give for his meat.

5669. If it is coming cheaply and coming fairly within their reach, would they not prefer paying an extra 1 *d.* per pound for the American meat to buying the offal?—It has been given in evidence that the American meat cannot come below 6 *d.* per pound, and for 6 *d.* you can buy a lot of offal.

5670. Do you know anything of the Schwartz system of obtaining cream from milk, which is used in Denmark and Germany?—No, I no not.

5671. You

Sir *George Jenkinson.*

5671. You spoke of glutting the market with dead meat, and you say that would be more the effect of importing dead meat than it would of importing live beasts into London?—Yes.

5672. You said also that the surplus live beasts of London could be sent down into the country within a radius of 200 miles, and you mentioned several large towns; but is it not the fact that the American meat comes to many ports nearer those towns than London is; for instance, Liverpool would supply Manchester?—Yes.

5673. Why would you not rather supply those towns within that radius of 200 miles, such as Manchester, and so on, with the American meat which was landed in Liverpool and Bristol, rather than with the live beasts from London?—It is at their option to do so; and it appears to me, from the evidence, that they prefer live meat, because the American meat comes in in an uncertain state; and I believe that evidence has been given here that the people of Liverpool and Manchester prefer to have it alive to dead, because a man can keep his live things over for a few days or a week, or as long as he likes, but if he buys this American meat it must be consumed at once.

5674. But if it is the fact that importing live meat is dangerous to the herds and flocks of this country, would the circumstance that people prefer live meat to dead meat be any reason why the flocks and herds of the whole of the agricultural classes should be jeopardised by that means?—Yes; but I do not admit that these diseases are foreign diseases, except cattle plague, which you can protect the country from. If the foreign animals are attacked with any disease, they are not allowed to come into the country, so that I do not admit that the foreigner introduces those diseases; they are home diseases, and I think you have more in this country than we have abroad. Cattle plague must not come here at any time; and by proper management you can keep it out. If any proper regulations had been made, cattle plague would not have come the last time.

5675. It is very easy to lock the stable-door after the steed is stolen?—I suppose experience would teach us how to prevent in future.

5676. But, in point of fact, cattle plague has been imported on every occasion from abroad, has it not?—It was imported from Russia first; then you prohibited Russia altogether. This last time it was imported into England by smuggling, and by bad regulations on the other side, and I think by a great neglect on this side. I believe that the Government could very well protect itself from ever bringing cattle plague into this country again.

5677. But if the American meat is good, why should it not supply the wants of the community just as well as live stock?—I do not think you have given it trial enough. The one is a trade that it has taken 35 years to create. The foreigner has found that he has got a market here; he has imported most valuable animals, bullocks and sheep, which I have been a great medium of supplying, and he really supplies you with a lot of wholesome food. All at once you say, "I will hunt you out of the market," by compelling him to bring dead meat here which he cannot do, or by saying, "You shall send your goods to a market where there is no fair trade." If you

Sir *G. Jenkinson*—continued.

Mr. *Gebhardt.*

18 June 1877.

prefer American meat to the foreign meat give the foreigner proper notice: two or three, or four or five years; let us wait until the American meat trade has developed in the way that some people think it will. Of course I am not a prophet, and I cannot say whether it will or not; but why should you do away with a healthy and good supply of meat and substitute for it a doubtful one? I am a practical man of business and a practical farmer, and I do not believe that pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease are foreign diseases. If you talk about cattle plague I say you ought not to have cattle plague, because you have the assurance now of Prussia who has made this new regulation, that cattle on arriving from the Silesian frontier cannot proceed by rail, but must be unloaded and must travel on foot, I believe, 25 or 50 miles, I do not know which, and that all due precautions are taken. I believe scientific men think that it is three, or four, or five, or at the lastest period, seven days, before cattle plague develops, and I think you have every guarantee in the world against cattle plague.

5678. I think you spoke of American beef having often been sold for English beef, to the great advantage of the butcher?—Yes, there is no doubt about that.

5679. That would go to prove that the American beef was not inferior to the English beef, would it not?—I never said it was inferior; if it comes in a good state it is very good.

5680. As a matter of fact, if the American trade does not pay, it will cease of its own accord, will it not?—I should say so.

5681. And if it does pay it will continue?—Yes.

5682. Therefore, you may leave it to take care of itself, like other trades?—Of course.

5683. Why should you have artificial legislation to protect any class of trade?—That is what I do not want.

5684. You do not want it, because you want to continue live importation?—I want to leave things as they are. If the Government make proper arrangements to protect this country from cattle plague, and then let the other trade develop itself as it likes, if the foreigner finds in course of time that America can produce cheaper meat than the Continent can, he will stop out of the market. But how would you like it, if all the English goods which go to Germany were all at once prohibited, and you were told that the market was now closed?

5685. I think you spoke of the importation of dead meat, and said that it would hurt the farmer more than anyone else?—I do not see where the English farmer would find his market. If you had 7,000 carcases in London, there would not be much room for him to sell his beasts.

5686. It is your opinion that it would hurt the English farmer more than anyone else?—I think it would hurt him quite as much as it would anybody else.

5687. If that is so, and the farmers are willing to take the risk, it concerns themselves alone, does it not?—Yes, but they are not asked the question.

5688. Then you are advocating, so to say, the interests of the English farmer when you say that it would hurt him more than anyone else?—I say that the English beasts are generally better beasts than the foreign beasts, and if we get

Mr. *Gebhardt.*

18 June 1877.

Sir *G. Jenkinson*—continued.

glutted with one class of meat the other class will not come.

5689. You said also, did you not, that to continue to import the American meat would raise the price of meat all over the country?—No, I did not say that exactly.

Chairman.

5690. I understood you to say that if this change which is proposed took place, the prices would fall in London and rise in the country?—Yes, for a certain class of meat.

Sir *George Jenkinson.*

5691. That would be good for the farmer, would it not?—It is a question, then, whether the farmer would like to sell his meat at the same price.

Chairman.

5692. I understood you to say that it would tend to lower the prices generally, because if you lost what is at present your best market, viz., the Islington Market, the prices all over the country would fall as the result of that; and if you got the London market, you would so reduce the prices, not only in the Deptford part of it, but in the Islington part, that you would thus reduce the production of the home-stock.

Sir *George Jenkinson.*

5693. You stated that the importation of dead meat would hurt the farmers more than anybody else, and then you stated that it would tend to raise the price of meat all over the country; and again, you said that it would very much injure the foreign cattle-dealers: I do not see how you can reconcile a gain to the farmer on the one hand, by the rise of price, and a loss to the farmer, on the other hand, by the importation of live stock?—My meaning is this: If you bring 4,000 foreign beasts to kill them at Deptford during the grass season of the year, and you bring 3,000 American beasts, those 7,000 carcases of beef would be all in London, and would have to be consumed in London, because people do not attempt to take this dead meat down into the country, and the result would be that the English producer would suffer.

5694. That is the affair of the farmer, is it not?—I only say that it is my opinion that the English farmer would lose his market, because if we have 7,000 carcases of beef there is no room for any more.

5695. But he can sell at Birmingham, and Liverpool, and Bristol, and Manchester?—Yes, if he can find customers.

5696. You say that under the restrictions on the admission of foreign cattle the American meat trade has kept the prices down?—Yes, of course it has.

5697. Then where have they risen?—I do not know that they have risen at all.

5698. You stated, in answer to an honourable Member, that they had risen in Birmingham and Manchester?—The prices are always higher there than they are here, or else they would not come here to buy.

5699. If it is always dearer there, the dearness is not caused by the importation of dead meat, is it?—But they can come and buy our stock at the Islington Market, which they cannot do at Deptford.

Sir *G. Jenkinson*—continued.

5700. But you said that it was the importation of American meat which kept down the prices; if that is the case, it must be good for the whole community?—Of course it is, if it comes sound.

5701. You have expressed a very strong opinion about the importation of dead meat not succeeding, because of its uncertainty; have you ever read a report from a Departmental Commission in 1869, the Commission consisting of Arthur Helps, Esq., Frederick Outram, Esq., T. H. Farrer, Esq., and Dr. Alexander Williams, and being appointed to consider the powers entrusted to the Privy Council by Section 64 of the Act of 1869?—I know nothing about it; I have never read it.

5702. If, with regard to the conveyance of dead meat by sea from foreign countries into the United Kingdom, they expressed in that report the opinion that no legislation would overcome the difficulties attending the transmission of dead meat by sea, do you think that was a premature opinion, and one which was not justified by facts?—The importation of dead meat has not taken place to any extent, except from America; otherwise the importation of foreign meat has been very moderate indeed; it has, to a great extent, failed.

5703. But, in point of fact, the importation of dead meat from America does succeed, does it not?—I think partly so, and partly not.

5704. I think you stated that there was no importation of store stock into London; are there not a number of dairy cows brought into London which are imported from abroad?—Yes, they might be imported to another place; they need not go to the Islington Market.

5705. But, in point of fact, are they not imported and sold in London?—Yes, they are.

5706. Then what are they but stores?—They are not stores; they are milch-cows for the London dairies.

5707. They are not for slaughtering?—No.

5708. All stock bought for home use you would call store stock, would you not?—No, I would call store stock young stock bought to graze for fattening; and the other stock I would call by their proper name, "dairy cows."

5709. The supply of milk to London is very important, is it not?—Yes, very.

5710. And therefore that supply of dairy cows is very important for London, I presume?—I do not say that they should not import dairy cows, but I do not think they should go to a fat market.

Mr. *French.*

5711. You spoke a few minutes ago with regard to bullocks being employed for ploughing in Germany; did I correctly understand you to say that the farm-work in Germany is done exclusively by those animals?—In some parts it is very nearly so.

5712. In answer to a question which was put to you before the Committee in 1873, you said that the small farmers rear the bullocks and break them to the plough, and that when they are two or three years old they sell them; do they sell them then for work at the plough, or to be fattened?—For the plough.

Mr. *Anderson.*

5713. You do not believe in foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia being imported diseases?—I do not.

5714. You

Mr. *Anderson*—continued.

5714. You think that they are indigenous in this country?—Yes.

5715. And therefore, whatever regulation which we make, or whatever attempts may be adopted, to stamp them out in this country, we shall always be liable to their recurrence?—That is my idea.

5716. I gather from your evidence that your general opinion is that the importation of dead meat is a very good thing, and has benefited the community considerably, but that it would never do to trust to it entirely?—Yes, that is my opinion.

Sir *Rainald Knightley.*

5717. You said on Friday, in answer to a question which was put to you by the Chairman, that the great objection to importing dead meat from Germany was that they had got no ice?—Yes.

5718. Do you really mean seriously to tell the Committee that the climate in the north of Germany is so sultry that water does not freeze there in the winter?—I do not believe that as a fact; in many winters they have got sufficient ice to fill their ice-cellars, even for ordinary purposes.

5719. Have you ever known a winter in the north of Germany in which there has been no frost?—I have known winters in which the frost has been very slight. This last winter I do not believe that the navigation of the Elbe has been stopped for one week, and that is a pretty good criterion.

5720. Surely when there is plenty of ice (and there is almost always ice in the north of Germany) there can be no difficulty in storing it; it is not an expensive process?—They must have it first before they can store it. Last winter was a very mild winter; and I believe that if they ever attempted the process of bringing the meat here fresh from Germany in the American way, they must import ice from Norway and Sweden.

5721. You said just now, in answer to an honourable Member, that the great difficulty that you had was in dealing with the offal, inasmuch as there was not a sufficient demand for the offal abroad?—There is not.

5722. Were you in the room the other day, when an American witness stated that they utilised the heart and the liver, and all the portions that were good for human food, by turning them into bolognas, and the fat into tallow-candles, and the hoofs and the horns into glue, and that they in fact utilised the whole of the beast?—Yes, I was.

5723. If they can do that in America, cannot they do it in Germany?—No; what you could do in New York, which is a very large town, is quite a different thing from what you could do in Tonning, where there are only about 3,000 inhabitants.

5724. But might not those things be utilised and converted into exportable commodities, as the American witness described to us?—I do not know exactly what he said about it; but I can only say that in a small place like Tonning, where there are only about 3,000 inhabitants, I believe that the offal would be almost worthless, because they could not consume it, and they cannot export it.

5725. Could they not export it in the shape of tallow-candles and bolognas?—Fat and hides

Sir *R. Knightley*—continued.

you can utilise everywhere; but, taking what we call offal (that is, the heart, the liver, the tongue, the tail, and the kidneys), what could you do with all this stuff in a little place like Tonning? Yankees can do a great deal more than other people, but I do not think that our people could do it.

Mr. *Gebhardt.*

18 June 1877.

Colonel *Kingscote.*

5726. I suppose you are aware that in the North of Germany and Denmark the dairy-farmers use ice to a very large extent for cooling their milk?—Yes.

5727. Do you not think that they might use ice, if they were pushed to it, for cooling meat as well?—Yes; but what a much less quantity of ice they would require to cool milk. A steamer from Tonning brings 500 live bullocks; if you put 2,000 quarters of beef into that steamer, what a lot of ice you would require.

5728. Very much less in proportion; I believe that a ton of ice will bring 10 carcases?—I have heard that each carcase requires half-a-ton of ice; I do not know that it has been stated in the room here.

5729. But ice could be got very cheap, if the trade once began there, could it not?—I do not say that it is impossible that it could be done were they obliged to do it; but it is a matter of price, and it is a question whether it would answer.

5730. One of your chief reasons for saying that the dead meat cannot supply the metropolis is that when a cargo comes in it gluts the market, and there is no regular supply; but are you not aware that they have a depôt already, and intend to have others; and likewise that a witness before this Committee stated that the steamers were going to be fitted up in compartments, so that they need not open them all at one time, and that therefore when the dead meat comes over it will be supplied to the market as the market requires it; if they carried out that system, would not that answer your objection?—No, because, first of all, I like to act upon proofs, and this has not been proved. But supposing that the importation of foreign cattle that we have hitherto had were to continue, that is to say, 4,000 a week, and supposing that the importation of American meat should continue at the rate of 3,000 carcases a week, it would not be a sudden glut, it would be always a glut; there would be considerably more meat here than would be consumed, and consequently one trade would go against the other, and they would be both ruined and would both cease. If you made a law to say that all foreign beasts should, after the 1st of July, be killed at Deptford, supposing the American supply to continue at the same rate as now, you would get a glut of meat in London that you could not sell, and the price would be so bad then that neither trade could stand it.

5731. That would soon regulate itself, would it n ot—No, it would not; a glut in London would deprive the country buyer of cheap meat; as long as it suited the foreigner to send his meat here there would be a glut.

Mr. *Arthur Peel.*

5732. What country do you look to in the future as the source of our supply of live cattle?—In the summer you look to Schleswig-Holstein as one great source of supply, and to Holland.

Mr. *Gebhardt.*

18 June 1877.

Mr. *Arthur Peel*—continued.

5733. But not to Germany?—No, not at this time of the year.

5734. You think that Germany imports meat herself?—Germany imports in the grass season a great many Schleswig-Holstein beasts to use in Germany Proper.

5735. France is not an exporting country, is she?—France exported a great many beasts from Normandy to this country as long as they could go to the Islington Market; but the moment France was compelled to go to Deptford with those fine great beasts, making from 30 *l.* to 40 *l.*, they discontinued sending. There is no law to prevent France from sending but they have not come.

Chairman.

5736. There is a law to prevent France now, at least it is revoked on the 30th?—Yes, but there was not last year, and they did not send a bullock. They might have sent, but they did not because the price did not pay them.

Mr. *Arthur Peel.*

5737. As a matter of fact France is importing largely now from Germany, is she not?—Yes, particularly sheep.

5738. I think you stated that when the French frontier was opened we lost half our supply?—Yes.

5739. Then you do not look to Germany for our supply for the future?—Yes, I look to Germany for the first six months in the year, particularly for our sheep supply.

5740. Do you think that she would be a continuous exporter to this country?—Yes, I think that the exportation from Germany, till the last Order in Council, has been increasing very considerably.

5741. So long as she closes the Austrian and Russian frontiers, I suppose she would not have much to spare?—She does not import sheep from those countries, but only cattle. For the five months of the grass season I look to Schleswig-Holstein as one of the great supplies to this country for meat.

5742. Under those circumstances do you think that we shall have enough supply exclusively of America to meet the wants of the country?—We have always had enough up to last year, because this American trade is quite an additional supply.

5743. Do you not think that the competition will be rather between American dead meat and American live meat, than between American dead meat and continental live meat?—I think that the Americans will try to bring their meat alive in preference to bringing it dead.

5744. Do they bring any live cattle to England from the River Plate?—I think that there have been one or two trials made; but I think that the great importation of live cattle now comes from the United States and from Canada.

Mr. *Chaplin.*

5745. I understood you to say that you have lately had less cattle than usual?—Yes.

5476. And that that is in consequence of the recent restrictions upon the importation of live cattle from the Continent?—Yes.

5747. I suppose that you would be glad to see those restrictions removed or relaxed?—Of course, the moment it could be done without danger, we should like to see the restrictions relaxed.

Mr. *Chaplin*—continued.

5748. It would tend to improve your business, I suppose?—Yes, of course.

5749. I understood you to say that if the importation to this country was limited to dead meat alone, the trade could, in your opinion, scarcely be carried on at all?—Yes, that is my idea.

5750. You say that if it was limited to dead meat, the trade in this country could not be carried on; do you think that it would be so if the present system of importing dead meat from America was so nearly perfected that we could always rely on a regular supply of meat in first-rate order?—Of course if the meat could always come in first-rate order, it would be a certain supply; but as long as there are these doubts about it, I do not think it would be right to rely upon it. It is a question which I could hardly answer, because it depends upon whether the people who like to buy live animals would like to buy dead meat; and that remains to be proved. I should think hardly anybody could answer that at present, until it has been put to the test.

5751. But I understood you to say that if the import into this country was limited to dead meat, you could not carry on the trade?—I do not believe that a dead meat trade altogether would answer, because it has been proved that if the American meat arrives and can be consumed at once, all right and well, but if it is not consumed directly, it spoils. They must find out a means to preserve the meat in a sound state, because when a man buys his stock alive, he can keep it and kill it when he requires it, but if he buys it dead, and knows that it will deteriorate, he will give more money for it alive.

5752. Are you aware that we have had evidence that an unlimited supply of dead meat could be delivered to this country from America, in perfect order, at 6 *d.* per lb.; and not only that, but that meat delivered in that perfect order at Liverpool, would travel further and keep better than meat killed in England?—I think that it would be very unwise to legislate on such a matter before you have proof of it.

5753. Assuming that that turned out to be correct there would be an absolute impossibility in carrying on a trade limited entirely to dead meat, would there?—Yes, I see great objection to it, because I believe that in a great many places it would not answer; but a man would prefer to have his meat alive to having it dead, even if he could not get it without paying a higher price for it.

5754. In reference to an answer which you gave to the Member for Sheffield you said, as I understood, that the effect of slaughtering all the live cattle at Deptford would be temporarily to make the meat cheaper in London, and to raise the price at the great centres of industry?—Yes, because we have a lot of meat at Deptford which they would be glad to get, and we have no sale for it.

5755. Do you know what is the average price per pound of the meat which we derive from the cattle that are imported alive from the Continent?—I should say that the price would be from 7½ *d.* to 8½ *d.* per pound.

5756. And

Mr. *Chaplin*—continued.

5756. And the price of American dead meat, I understand, is about 6 *d.* per pound when it is in good order?—Yes, it is sold for more than that. It appears from the evidence that 6 *d.* is the price at which they can afford to send it, but I have known it make 7 *d.* or 8 *d.* per pound.

5757. Not less than 6 *d.*?—I have known it to make 1½ *d.*

5758. Would the price average 6 *d.*?—No, I do not believe that it ever made 6 *d.* on the average. My firm opinion is that it has been a losing game.

5759. It may have been a losing game to the exporter but not to the consumer?—No; I mean to the people who embark in it, but I have no evidence to give upon that point.

5760. You consider it to be better than beef from the Continent?—I consider the bulk of the American beef of a better quality than the bulk of the Continental beef. If you could get it in the same condition I should say that the American meat has the advantage.

5761. It has been proved that the American meat travels perfectly well to London, and that it pays the exporter to be sold at 6 *d.* per lb.?—Yes, that has been in evidence.

5762. Then why cannot it be delivered to Birmingham?—It has been I believe; they have had some there, but I do not think that they are very fond of it.

5763. We arrive at this, do we not; that American dead meat can be delivered at Birmingham at 6 *d.* per pound, and the foreign cattle from the Continent cannot be sold there at less than 8 *d.* per pound?—I did not say so. You asked me what it makes, and I said before in my evidence that I believed that they could afford on the Continent to go on breeding for a time, even though prices by degrees should diminish, just as the English farmer if he cannot get 6 *s.* per stone must take 5 *s.*, and that would not stop his breeding. Thirty years ago what is now worth 6 *s.* a stone was not worth 4 *s.*, so that the trade must regulate itself; but these rapid revolutions upset any trade.

5764. Do you suppose that meat from the foreign live cattle could ever be sold at a profit to the exporter in those centres of industry at 6 *d.* per pound?—Yes, it was sold 30 years ago.

5765. I am not speaking of 30 years ago, but of the present time?—If it took 30 years to go up it might take 30 years to go down, because in the case of anything which you like to mention, the demand and supply regulate the price, and just as the foreign producer would be satisfied or must be satisfied if he gets less money, so would the English producer. It is a matter of trade. I do not say that if they could not get more than 6 *d.* per pound for it abroad they would continue to send it; but it would not be done in one year or one day. Trade regulates itself in that.

5766. At all events, at the present moment, I do not understand that you believe that it would pay them to export their foreign cattle to be sold at 6 *d.* per pound?—No; but if they had the cattle on hand, and had no other market, they would be obliged to send them.

5767. But if 6 *d.* per pound were the most they could expect to get for it they would seek for another market?—They would try to find other markets in the future.

5768. American dead meat could be delivered in Birmingham to pay them well at 6 *d.* per pound, could it not?—It may or may not pay them; but, take it for granted that 6 *d.* per pound pays them; I do not believe that it does.

5769. So that it appears that we can have an unlimited supply of American dead meat at 6 *d.* per pound at those centres of industry, and you think that if 6 *d.* per pound was all that could be obtained by the exporters from the Continent, they would seek another market?—It would be better to leave the trade to find it out for itself.

5770. I wanted to know what your opinion was about it?—My opinion is, that if you give the trade a fair chance, letting the American meat come dead, and letting the foreign Continental meat come alive, then the buyer will find out which suits him best; whether he can give more for the foreign or the American meat; and if it does not pay the foreigner to come, he will find out other markets; but if you prohibit this live trade on a sudden, and if you make the foreign trade totally a dead-meat trade, let the foreigner know, and then he must do the best he can.

5771. Do you know what the average price of meat in Birmingham is at present?—I do not.

5772. You do not know whether it is more or less than 6 *d.* per lb.?—I should certainly think that it is more, because they would not come here and buy the sheep if it is not more.

5773. If they can obtain dead meat from America at that price, I do not see how that is consistent with your statement that to prohibit the importation of live cattle, or to insist upon the slaughter of it at Deptford, raised the price of meat in Birmingham?—It is because they do not like the article. We have not had a Birmingham man here, but we have had a Manchester man, and a Liverpool man, and they say that they do not like the meat, and that they could not deal in it.

5774. Are you aware that according to some of the evidence that we have had, the American meat is excellent?—Yes; I know it is if it comes in good condition.

Chairman.

5775. You think that the Birmingham men are considerably sharper than the London West End butchers, who have been, according to the evidence, dealing in this American meat for some time?—Of course, butchers do not put the name on it, and say it is American meat; and as long as it does not smell, it is very good meat.

5776. You think that we are so little fastidious in this town that we take it as English meat, although they will not at Birmingham?—That is so.

5777. You wish to represent to the Committee that if this American meat is to form the principal portion of our meat consumption in this country, it should do so by testing it in competition with the other trades?—That is it; give it a fair trial.

5778. And if it can be sold so good and so cheap, it will eventually establish itself?—It may be so.

5779. I suppose you are aware of the very large increase that was pointed out to us in the import from America, even up to the last few days?—Yes; of course the prohibition of foreign

Mr. *Gebhardt.*

18 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

beasts from Germany, and their not being in the market, made it a better market for the American beef.

5780. Whilst nearly 18,000,000 lbs. came over in 1876, 17,685,000 lbs. came over in the first four months of this year from America, showing an enormous stride in the importation?—Yes.

5781. And having come over, as you say, because there was a market, it may continue to find a market as against the foreign import?—I have not the slightest doubt that if it pays them they will try to improve the trade.

5782. You have stated that the first effect of this glut in the market would be a reduction in the price of the foreign meat?—Yes.

Chairman—continued.

5783. I think you also stated that it would be sometime before the foreign supply would totally cease under the conditions of its being slaughtered at Deptford, but that it would diminish year by year for some time before it finally found its way into other markets?—Yes.

5784. During all that time, if the American meat still held its own, you would get a general reduction in the price in London?—Yes.

5785. That would be a great benefit to the consumer, would it not?—Yes, for a time.

Wednesday, 20th June 1877.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Major Allen.	Mr. Elliot.
Mr. Anderson.	Mr. French.
Mr. Assheton.	Mr. King Harman.
Mr. Jacob Bright.	Colonel Kingscote.
Mr. Cameron of Lochiel.	Mr. M'Lagan.
Mr. Chamberlain.	Mr. Murphy.
Mr. Chaplin.	Mr. Pease.
Mr. James Corry.	Mr. Arthur Peel.
Mr. Dease.	Sir Henry Selwin Ibbetson.
Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.	Mr. Torr.

SIR HENRY SELWIN IBBETSON, BART., IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. MARCUS POOL, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

5786. I BELIEVE you are a Cattle Salesman in London?—I am.

5787. Your business is principally connected with the Deptford Market, is it not?—Both with the Islington and the Deptford Markets.

5788. You can, therefore, speak generally with regard to the sale of cattle at those markets?—I believe I can. If you will permit me before giving my evidence, I would say that I have been requested by Mr. Swan, of Edinburgh, to state, which in the hurried manner in which he was examined for want of time he omitted to state, viz., that the number of cattle which he sold last year was 650 oxen per week and 3,400 sheep, out of which only 20 per cent. were foreigners; and, therefore, his interest was more with the English trade than it was with the foreign trade. He desired me to state that if you will receive it.

5789. Mr. Swan wishes that put in evidence, because the impression might have been left upon the minds of the Committee from his examination that he was interested in the foreign import?—That he was more interested in the foreign import than in the home trade.

5790. Let us take the case of the Deptford Market first; will you describe to the Committee the process that goes on in that market, and the supply upon which you are dependent there?—The supply of the Deptford Market, in comparison with the London market, from foreign parts, has certainly to a very great extent diminished.

5791. Do you mean since the establishment of of the market?—Since the establishment of the market. I have not the slightest doubt that if foreign cattle continue to be sent to the Deptford Market, the supply will be still smaller, because they do not get a fair competition of the trade with reference to the small butchers; what we term retail butchers in the trade, who are generally unable to attend that market.

Chairman—continued.

5792. Can you give the Committee any figures showing that, as you have stated, the trade has fallen off in the Deptford Market?—I am not prepared with the figures, but I believe, if I am not mistaken, you are in possession of the figures. We know that the importation has not been so large, and particularly from Holland, and also from France.

5793. At present that importation, I suppose, would naturally be diminished, in consequence of a large number of German cattle having been absolutely prohibited?—I am speaking now with reference to the Dutch and French cattle. Of course the German cattle, of which we used to have a fair supply every year, have been prohibited, but at the same time the Dutch and the French cattle have been prohibited.

5794. You state that the trade at Deptford has decreased, but that, speaking of the last few months, a certain portion of that decrease may be attributed to the fact of the German trade having been altogether prohibited?—No; it has nothing to do with the German trade; it is only for want of buyers; we do not meet with fair competition.

5795. I am afraid we do not understand each other; what I meant was that if the German cattle were added to whatever came from France or other scheduled countries, and were slaughtered at Deptford, then, as soon as the German cattle were absolutely prohibited, you naturally lost a certain portion of your supply?—Yes.

5796. And that might account for the fact of the recent diminution of the Deptford Market?—That might account for the total number; but it will not interfere as regards the number of buyers that we have to depend upon.

5797. Has the number of buyers steadily diminished, notwithstanding that there is a large supply in the Deptford Market?—Whatever quantity we have, I do not believe that the number of buyers has at any time exceeded 30 butchers,

Mr. *Pool.*

20 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

butchers, principally belonging to the wholesale trade, making their purchases in the Deptford Market; whereas, if we were in the London Market, we should have the assistance of perhaps as many hundreds.

5798. And that is to be attributed to the fact that it does not pay the retail butcher to keep a slaughter-house at Deptford?—Certainly.

5799. And that, consequently, the trade is limited to those butchers who have their business and their slaughter-houses at Deptford itself?—Yes.

5800. And that, you state, has reduced the number of butchers since the starting of the the market?—We have not had fair competition of the butchers, because the retail butchers have never attended the Deptford Market; we have always been in the hands of a few buyers, which has tended to decrease the trade.

5801. As it is limited, they can dictate their price?—They can do so as a rule, and particulary in a bad market; we are in their hands.

5802. That you do not find to be the case in the Islington Market; there, a large number of men, I suppose, purchase for private slaughter-houses throughout the town?—Yes.

5803. And you would represent to the Committee that that gives a better trade than the limited competition which exists at Deptford?—Certainly.

5804. Has that limited competition at Deptford at all influenced the number of cattle that have been sent over to this country from countries that had to send to Deptford Market?—Certainly I think it has, and I think it will do so more if it continues.

5805. What countries have diminished their supplies in consequence?—I have not the figures before me, which I believe you are acquainted with, but we have the principal supply at the Deptford Market from France and Holland, Germany having been entirely excluded. Of course the prices and the markets vary very much, and in consequence of the Continental exporters not having free trade to send their cattle to the Islington Market, and being compelled to send them only to the Deptford Market, they cannot send their usual quantity from France and Holland.

5806. From Holland has there been any great falling off in the supply?—I believe so.

5807. You cannot speak as to the figures there?—I believe the figures will prove that.

5808. France never sent us very much cattle, did she?—Yes, they have sent large quantities at times to the Islington Market when they could come to the Islington Market. I have had as many as 200 and 300 in one day myself for sale.

5809. Was that a constant supply?—Generally.

5810. But you are not able to give the Committee the number of cattle that came in the year when they went to Islington, showing the way in which that number has decreased since they have been restricted to Deptford?—I could have done so, but I did not think it was requisite, as I heard you were fully acquainted with the figures.

5811. We have had no figures with regard to the cattle imports from France or from Holland; but you tell the Committee that, from your experience of both markets, the diminution in the supply from those two countries has been very considerable?—I believe so; and it is not only a considerable diminution, but, I think, it will fall off more than it has done, and that they will find other markets.

Chairman—continued.

5812. You cannot give us, I suppose, the present supply from those countries to the Deptford Market?—It is nominal; not so many as one salesman used to have consigned to him to sell in one day. I believe there are only 28 head of cattle coming to the Deptford Market tomorrow from Holland.

5813. At present, you say that the supply from those countries is merely nominal?—Yes.

5814. Can you tell us how this diminution in the supply has affected the price to the consumers in London?—I do not think it has a material effect upon the prices; that is principally due to the importation of American meat.

5815. You state to the Committee, that the absolute prohibition of the German cattle, and the restriction which the slaughter at Deptford has produced on the French and Netherlands supply, have not been felt in the price of meat, to the consumer here?—I do not think it has, as I say, on account of the importation of American meat

5816. You consider that the American meat has filled up the gap, which otherwise would have been created by the loss of the foreign import?—No doubt the importation would have been increased, if they had a fair open market. I do not think that the increase of supply would have been likely to have been sent to the Deptford Market.

5817. What I want to arrive at is, your opinion on this point; whether the American meat has filled up the gap which was produced, either by the restrictions as to slaughter at Deptford, or by absolute prohibition upon the foreign importation?—It has to a certain extent, and I believe that its having come, has been a very great boon to this country.

5818. And to such an extent that the prices have not risen to the consumers in London?—I believe they have not.

5819. Supposing that the foreign supply had been, as you suggested it ought to have been, free, and that it had come in at a time when, as you say, the American supply has filled up the gap and satisfied the wants of the people, because the prices have not risen; what would have been the effect upon the London market, if both those supplies had been competing here?—The prices would naturally have been lower still.

5820. Under those prices, would the foreign trade have come here?—I believe that the foreign trade would continue when they can compete and have an open free trade. I do not think that they intend to send their stock, but they will try to find other markets.

5821. Following that out a little further, you say that if it was a free market, and there were open competition, you believe that they would still send; but the price of the American meat, at which it can be sold in London, has been represented to this Committee to be 6*d.* per pound; if the glut in the market, as you described, reduced the price, would the effect upon the foreign trade be such as has been described by previous witnesses; that is to say, to stop it, and throw the foreign trade into Paris, Berlin, and other capitals?—That

Chairman—continued.

That is in reference to the question of the importation being continued to Deptford.

5822. No; I am asking you, with regard to your proposition, that the foreign trade should be free, and should come into the market without restrictions from those countries; you have admitted that the American trade has filled up the gap which was made by this trade being driven out of the market by restrictions; if they had both been in the market, would not the effect have been the glut which other people have described as absolutely likely to drive the foreign trade away from this country?—I do not believe that there would have been a glut. I believe that the prices would not have been so high as they are at the present moment, if both quantities had come in one open market together.

5823. If they had come both in one open market together, and the American meat had been selling at 6 *d.* per pound, would not the effect of the glutted market have been to bring down the foreign meat to the same level?—It would, in one sense, but that is, providing that the American meat came in good condition; of course that is the principal question.

5824. But you admit that, even with the American meat in the condition in which it has come over, there is some portion of it good, and some portion of it in an unsatisfactory state; still the markets have been properly supplied, and the price has not shown any lack of supply in the meat markets?—No; but you must understand that the British farmers have received the benefit of that, because they have got a higher price for their article in consequence of the supply not having been so strong; and consequently, if the two supplies had been together, naturally the prices would have been lower.

5825. Unless you wish to correct the first part of your evidence, I do not think that it will stand, because if those prices have not gone up to the consumer, I suppose the prices have not gone up to the seller. The butchers have been able in maintaining their prices to maintain the prices to the farmer; they have not increased those prices, or else they would have increased the prices to the consumer?—The prices are certainly higher now for the English cattle than they have been for some years past. One must have an effect upon the other. If the importation of both live cattle and dead meat are of a large quantity, naturally the prices would come to an average.

5826. But we cannot blow hot and cold; we cannot say that the price has not risen, and yet say that the price has risen; I understood you to say that during the time of those restrictions the price had not risen to the consumer, and you account for that by saying that the American meat has filled up the gap which was made by the withdrawal of the foreign supply?—Yes.

5827. Then, supposing that your wish with regard to the foreign trade had been carried out, we should have had during this winter the American meat and the foreign supply; we should then have had the market, as other witnesses have described, glutted, which would have reduced the price all over the country, and would have driven the foreigners out of our markets?—No, I do not think so.

5828. They say that it would have driven them out of our market, but with that you do not agree?—I cannot say that it would have driven the foreigners out of the market, because they look for a fair competition.

5829. But they would have to compete with the American meat at a price at which it has been stated that the foreigner could not send his cattle over here at a profit from abroad, from France, from Germany, and from the Netherlands; it has been stated to us, that if the price of foreign meat was 6 *d.* per pound, the effect would be to drive the foreign animals into Paris, Berlin, and other markets?—Very probably it would. If the prices were higher on the Continent than they are in London, naturally they would, and the Americans would not send their meat if the prices were lower here than elsewhere.

5830. Then as you admit that the trade has been amply supplied by this American meat; I should like to know why you think that there is such an absolute necessity for the continued free import of foreign animals if the markets are sufficiently supplied, and if a larger supply would so glut them as to drive away the trade?—I believe that there is certainly a necessity for a free import, because otherwise the farmers on the Continent would diminish their stock, and go back to their former mode of farming their farms as they did some 20 or 30 years ago. I remember the time when the importation from Holland was only 500 cattle a week; I remember the time when there were only a few head of cattle from Tonning, whereas we have now several thousands, and, consequently, those farmers would certainly go back upon the old principle, and it is my firm belief that in course of time we should not receive any cattle at all from many parts of the Continent.

5831. But our supply to the consumer in England would be sufficient and satisfactory, because the gap would be filled by the meat which has filled it during the last few months?—No; it would certainly diminish. If the farmers went back to the old principle, and did not produce the quantity of stock which they at present produce, the importation would be smaller; and in what position would you be in the event of the American prices getting higher, or the market getting lower in London, because then they would naturally also cease to send?

5832. If what you suggest as a possibility happened, viz., that the American trade, finding that we are dependent upon them, raised their prices or refused to send meat over, prices would naturally rise in this country from the 6 *d.* to which they have been reduced by the American trade?—Certainly.

5833. That being so, the prices having gone up, would not the supply from abroad which had been taken from us to Paris and Berlin, return here in consequence of its being a good market again?—By that time probably the farmers on the Continent might have reduced their stock, and might not be in a position to send you the cattle.

5834. That is supposing that they have no other outlets for that stock than Great Britain?—Supposing that they have no other outlets than Great Britain for that stock, or supposing that France or any other country would not suit them, they would naturally decrease their stock, and farm, as they did 30 or 40 years ago; and by that time very probably there might not be the

Mr. *Pool.*

20 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

the stock in hand which is required for this country.

5835. I should like you to describe to the Committee why you believe that this foreign import is required for this country, when you state that it has practically ceased, and become nominal, and that, notwithstanding its having become nominal, the consumer has not suffered?—Because the supply in this country has diminished; I am a farmer myself, and I am a breeder of stock, but at the same time it is my firm opinion that if the British farmers would have done the same as they have done on the Continent, and increased their number of stock as the foreigners have done, naturally we should not be dependent upon the importation either of dead meat or live animals into this country from foreign parts. But the British farmers have found a better mode of paying their rent than breeding cattle.

5836. Do you mean by growing corn?—By growing corn and other produce, whatever would pay them best.

5837. Then, as a farmer, you do not dread these diseases as some farmers do, and you have not yourself decreased the breeding of stock on your farm in consequence of them?—I do not think there is any more dread as regards the disease than as regards anything else, because I do not think that even by prohibiting the importation entirely you will prevent the outbreak of disease taking place in this country, inasmuch as you cannot prevent any epidemic breaking out among human beings. I do not think that it would have any influence whatever as regards the stopping of diseases.

5838. Then you do not think that the farmer, if he was secure in his own mind as against what he believes to be a danger, that is to say, the importation of disease, would turn his attention, as he formerly did, more to breeding than to tillage?—I cannot say whether he would or not; they have had plenty of time to do so for the last 20 or 30 years if they felt so disposed; but I do not think that we ought to run any risk of any diseases, because I think that any country which cannot show a clean bill of health should be entirely prohibited, but that those which are clear and healthy ought not to have any restriction put upon them, and that their cattle ought to come to an open public free trade market.

5839. You are not afraid of the market being glutted by such an enormous supply as you have described, with free import of live cattle from abroad, and dead meat from America?—Certainly not.

5840. And you consider that the import of foreign meat is necessary for our supply, I suppose principally because of the danger of depending upon one string to your bow, the American one?—If the restrictions continue, I cannot say what might take place. As I have already stated, there has been an increase of cattle by so many thousands in various parts of the Continent, and consequently they might, perhaps, ultimately diminish the supply.

5841. But supposing that they diminished the supply, you would admit, would you not, that if that supply was made up from another quarter, the diminution would be immaterial?—I do not know what other quarter it could be supplied from.

Chairman—continued

5842. There is the dead-meat supply from America?—But that might cease. We have at the present moment the American supply to fall back upon; but I think I am in a position to give you a statement as regards my experience as I have something to do, or had something to do, with the American meat, and also with the sale of live cattle from America. It is my firm belief that the prices in America will increase until they are as high in that country as in any other country. Then, again, there is to be taken into consideration the present general state of affairs in reference to the business being so unfavourable. The freights are very low from America; the general freights from America are now only about 30 *s.* a ton for dead meat, and for live animals the same. The freight, in 1873, was 50 *s.* a ton. If the freight goes up, and if the prices there go up, we must naturally expect that the importation from there must cease, unless prices should rise in England.

5843. Then it comes really to this, that the American price at present would, from its being so low, drive the foreign import out of the country?—There is not the slightest doubt that they would go to better markets if they could find them.

5844. But the price rising in America, would bring back that foreign import into this country, unless what you have suggested occurred; viz., that the farmer in the meantime had turned his land to some other purposes?—Yes, and reduced his stock.

5845. You mentioned just now that you are acquainted with the American meat trade?—Yes.

5846. You seem to be a universal genius in trade?—Yes; I have had upwards of 30 years' experience, and I think that I can give you a little information which might be of some service to you.

5847. I should like exceedingly to learn how you have been connected with the American dead-meat trade, and what conclusion you have arrived at from your experience. Have you yourself imported largely?—I am only a commission salesman, and as such, consignments have been made to me, both live and dead.

5848. Have you had consignments of dead meat made to you from Liverpool, or from what part?—From America direct, *viâ* Liverpool, and also *viâ* Southampton.

5849. The consignments arrive, I suppose, both at Southampton and at Liverpool, brought over under one of these refrigerating processes?—Under one or the other of them, but upon different principles, I believe.

5850. And as such they arrive at Southampton or at Liverpool, cooled down by the process which has been described to the Committee?—I believe so.

5851. Have you any knowledge of the condition in which that meat arrives at those ports?—Yes; because it has been my interest to study it; I have gone aboard before any of the refrigerators have been opened, and I have noticed the condition in which the meat was.

5852. Will you tell the Committee what the process is that those two lines adopt; whether it is the dry-air process, or whether it is the process of ice being driven through pipes?—As regards the dry-air process, I am sorry to inform you that I have had two consignments from a firm of

Chairman—continued.

of the name of Lehmann, Samuels, and Brother, who are large butchers in New York, who export both meat and live cattle. They tried the experiment of the dry-air process, and they shipped 24 quarters of meat as an experiment, which, unfortunately, arrived here in a bad state, and they were seized in the meat market as being unfit for human food.

5853. That is not the same dry-air process that Mr. Bell, of Glasgow, adopts, is it?—I really cannot tell what process Mr. Bell adopts. Those gentlemen, not being deterred from trying it again, send another shipment of 24 quarters under the same process, and those 24 quarters were thrown overboard, because they got so bad during the passage that they could not bear the stench on board the ship. As regards the various processes, from the experience which I have had (and I think I have a letter in my possession now from some high authority on the other side, in the United States) that the process in which the meat is shipped from New York or from America is principally a speculation as regards the sale of certain patents.

5854. The Committee have not to go into the question of patents; but we have had before us a statement by Mr. Hamilton, who represents Mr. Bell, that, since 1875, he had been importing meat from America, not by the process of ice being driven through the pipes, but by the other process, which always arrived perfectly sound; and we have had Mr. Gillett stating to us that under the other process he has forwarded the meat in the condition which he described, both to Liverpool and to Bristol. I understand you to say that you have made experiments to Southampton and to Liverpool, and, as far as you have told us, the experience as regards the consignment that came to Southampton was not a very satisfactory one?—This came direct to London.

5855. What has been your experience with regard to the arrivals of the other cargoes which were consigned to you at Southampton and Liverpool?—They were about similar.

5856. It does not arrive in a satisfactory condition?—I believe not. It is a great pity that it should not, because it would be a great boon to this country if it came in good condition.

5857. Will you state the number of consignments which you have had, showing the Committee what your experience is?—I can give you the dates, and I can give you the totals. From the 22nd of August to the 16th of November last year, I had 4,266 quarters of beef, weighing 92,766 stone; of which 3,680 stone were condemned as unfit for food. The prices which it realised vary; the highest price was 5¼ *d.* per pound, the lowest price has been 2¼ *d.* per pound, and I believe the average price has been something like 4¾ *d.* per pound.

5858. Therefore you represent that if the statement is correct that 6½ *d.* is the remunerative price, those cargoes have not been a remunerative speculation?—Certainly not. I have with me a letter, which I have not the slightest objection to show you, conditionally of course; I do not wish the name published. I will show you the letter, and I think it will give you some light upon the matter.

5859. I think if it is not to be published I had better not see it?—It is only the name that I do not wish to be published; it is a private business, and it is a gentleman of high standing in the United States, and I think that it may throw some light upon the subject.

5860. I am afraid we cannot accept anything that is subject to not being published; have you continued your consignments?—No; I have ceased to receive any more.

5861. In consequence of the experiment not having been satisfactory?—In consequence of the consignments not having arrived in a satisfactory condition. At the same time the same parties, I believe, are still trying the experiment in the hopes of improving their condition.

5862. They may be some of those experimentalists who have, according to other witnesses in the trade, furnished these terrible samples of bad meat in London?—No, because I have had one consignment of 310 quarters of beef; one consignment of 323 quarters, and another of 385 quarters of Mr. Gillett, the gentleman who has given his evidence here; that was some of his meat.

5863. Was that some of the meat which he said he forwarded to London, finding it did not come over in quite satisfactory condition?—I beg your pardon. He came to me and asked me if I would undertake his agency for him at the time, knowing all the butchers connected with the market.

5864. I only mention that because Mr. Gillett said that, finding that some of the meat had not arrived in such a satisfactory state as they liked in Liverpool, so that they could not sell it there, they sent it to London?—I beg to differ from him there, because Mr. Gillett sent the whole cargo to London.

5865. Was that *viâ* Liverpool?—That was *viâ* Liverpool, but none of the cargo was sold at Liverpool during the time that I had to do with it.

5866. You also stated that you had had experience on this matter from having yourself visited the ships in which the meat came over; do you attribute the bad state in which this meat arrived to the condition in which it came over, or to its journey after being taken out of the refrigerator, and sent by rail to you?—I attribute it to various causes. From the information I have received, and from what I have noticed, it has been, I believe, because of not properly preparing the meat before it was shipped. I have also received meat of which neither the shipper nor the captain, nor the party in charge of the machinery could give any account as to the cause of its coming in bad condition, as the meat was shipped in good condition.

5867. May we infer from that that your evidence supports the evidence of the other gentlemen who have spoken as to the American trade, that the people out there are making experiments in order to ascertain the cheapest and easiest way of sending the meat over in proper condition to this country, and that when it comes in bad condition it is because one of those experiments has been tried which is not a success?—No, I believe they are working now under the same process as they did then.

5868. You are not able to speak personally with regard to what is taking place?—They work now under the same process as they did before, but whether there is any probability, by preparing the

Mr. *Pool.*

20 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

the meat in the ice-houses over there before it was shipped, of making it keep longer, I am not in a position to say. I should consider, however, that, from the length of time during which the importation of meat has taken place from America, if there was any likelihood of any improvement being made in the mode of shipment or of transit, they would, by June 1877, have had ample time from 1875, to find that process out.

5869. I suppose you would admit that probably they have improved their process to some extent, because it is stated, and I imagine that it must be true, that a very large amount of the meat comes over in good condition?--The same as it has done before. A large amount has come over in good condition, and a large amount has come over in bad condition in the same ship.

5870. And you do not believe that the trade has been a remunerative trade to the shipper?—Not according to the accounts which I have of the parties connected with it.

5871. Do you believe that a trade which has sent over in 1876 nearly 18,000,000 lbs. of this dead meat, and which has sent it over continuously during that time, through hot weather and all, and which has, since the beginning of this year, sent over in four months, nearly the same amount, viz., 18,000,000 lbs., can be a losing trade, it having gone on for nearly a year and a-half?—I do not believe that it is a remunerative trade. I believe that it is worked upon speculation as regards the patents; and as regards the increase of the amount of meat, it might have been on account of the publicity which has been given to it in this country, and the great outcry which has taken place. It is like a new piece coming out at a theatre. When there is a large announcement, or a great outcry about it in the newspapers, everybody goes to see it, but the question is whether it will continue.

5872. But the fact is that a play at a theatre does not continue if it is a failure?—We do not know that this will continue. I hope that it may continue.

5873. What I pointed out to you was that the trade has steadily risen from the time when it began up to the end of 1876; that in that year the totals sent over have been progressive, rising from a commencement of 162,000 lbs. to 3,036,000 lbs. in the last month, with a total for the whole year of nearly 18,000,000 lbs.; and that instead of falling off after a year's experience, as it ought to have done if it had been a losing trade, the first four months of this year have shown a steadily progressive increase, rising up in last month to 6,000,000 lbs. and odd, the total in the four months being as much as in the whole of last year. Therefore it has been for the last 16 months a steadily progressive trade; do you represent that during the whole of that time it has been a losing trade?—It has been in the hands of more parties; various parties are embarking in the speculation under various patents, and consequently you must have a larger supply.

5874. Can you, as a tradesman, state from your experience of trade, that you have ever known a trade steadily progress under steady loss?—No; certainly not. No one has.

5875. You represent to us that the trade is not a remunerative trade?—I do not think so according to the statements.

5876. And yet the figures, about which there can be no dispute, show that the trade has progressed in a way which is perfectly marvellous?—So it has; and I will tell you the reason why it has, according to my opinion; because it has developed itself into the hands of people who have been trying to make the experiment.

5877. You do not believe in the idea that where a trade develops itself into more hands, the profits naturally fall off, and, therefore, the losses to all those people must be even greater than in the original case?—It naturally would be so; but we cannot tell, of course.

5878. And you think that they are all willing to become bankrupt for the sake of giving us dead meat?—I do not say that. They keep sending their meat in hopes of finding a better market. No doubt they have had times when it has paid them; but taking it altogether, they keep sending it, the same as any other merchant sends his goods, in the hope of finding a better market.

5879. My only reason for pressing you was, that you stated that you believe that this trade would not be a remunerative one?—I beg your pardon, I think you must have misunderstood me; I said that the transaction which I was alluding to was not a remunerative one, because the price quoted was 6 *d.* per pound. I cannot say whether it will be a remunerative trade, or whether it will not; but these prices will show that it cannot be a remunerative one, if not less than 6 *d.* per pound, will pay the importer?

5880. If it is true that it is increasing, the probability is that you will admit that it is finding its level and becoming a remunerative trade?—I cannot say whether it will do so or not; but of course time will show that.

5881. But the probability is, from the fact of its steady increase, that it has got over the difficulties which originally existed, and that they are now sending it at a profit?—They might do so; I cannot say from experience now, because none comes to me, but I believe, from what I hear out of doors, that they do not make as much as 6 *d.* per pound.

5882. If it is shown that it is a remunerative trade, we may find that it fills up the gap caused by the loss of the foreign import, may we not?—I hope it will do so.

5833. And that, therefore, the import of foreign cattle is not so necessary to the consumer of this country as it was before we had this other supply?—Certainly, because I do not say that we can continue to depend upon this supply.

5884. Supposing that the American dead-meat trade was established, and that the meat could be brought over here in proper condition, would you represent to the Committee that, notwithstanding that, it would not supply the wants of the retail butchers, who now depend upon the foreign stock?—If they could send it at a remunerative price it might.

5885. If the American dead-meat trade is a successful trade, and they place the meat in a proper condition on the market, would that supply the want of the retail butchers, which has been described to us as creating one of the necessities for the foreign import?—I do not think that it would

Chairman—continued.

would supply the want of the retail butchers if 10,000 tons a day came.

5886. Would you tell me why that is your opinion?—Because I heard the butchers say it. There are a great many butchers whose trade it will not suit.

5887. Is that because their trade is carried on in unventilated shops, and without proper appliances for keeping the meat, and that therefore they require to kill the animal on the morning of sale?—They have been accustomed, I believe, from time immemorial, to kill the animals as their trade requires.

5888. In this country, what has been the custom from time immemorial is always very difficult to get over. I understand you to say that you think that if they had a dead-meat market for their daily supply from which they could take meat in as good condition as the fresh killed meat in their own slaughter-houses, they would not adopt that trade?—I should not think so, and I will tell you why. They have had from time immemorial also an opportunity to go to the Metropolitan Dead Meat Market and buy the meat. If it would answer their purpose to buy the meat in general they would always have done so. This dead-meat trade has been in existence as long as we have been in existence, and longer.

5889. The dead-meat trade has developed itself very much since the Smithfield Market has been created, I think?—I do not think it has. It has only been two or three markets thrown into one; Leadenhall Market and a portion of the other markets have been thrown into the same market.

5890. Could you tell the Committee who now keep up the Smithfield Market, which is a very extensive dead market?—Almost every butcher, I believe, goes there, but they do not purchase all their requirements there.

5891. Therefore the retail butcher in London does at the present moment depend very largely upon the dead-meat supply?—They do not depend upon the dead-meat supply any more than they have done in former years. They have always depended upon the dead-meat supply to a certain extent for making up their requirements. Some butchers may go to the meat market and may require principal joints, and other butchers may require other joints; consequently the meat market has been established upon the same principle, and the butchers have gone to the Metropolitan Market and purchased their stock there, and killed them when they required them; and they also went to the old meat market and purchased what they required there. But if it would answer the retail butchers' purpose to make all their purchases in the meat market, I do not understand they should not have done so 30 or 40 years ago, because they had the same opportunity to do so then as they have now.

5892. You do not believe that the dead-meat market has very much increased since the establishment of Smithfield?—I cannot tell whether it has, or not; but the population and the requirements are very much larger than they were then, and no doubt it has increased.

5893. Still you admit the fact, that a retail butcher does depend for some portion of his supply upon the dead-meat trade?—For some portion he may, no doubt.

Chairman—continued.

5894. Therefore, although he may have a fancy that he likes to keep live animals ready to slaughter, supposing that he was not able to get those animals, he would still have the means of supplying his customers with dead meat?—If a supply came to the market he would, but if it did not he could not.

5895. Whilst he might lose the animal from abroad, even if he still adhered to his old custom, he would be able to buy the animal from the Islington Market?—So he would at a different price, no doubt.

5896. Is there anything else that you would like to put before the Committee in your examination-in-chief?—I should very much like to say a word or two with reference to an observation which I have heard made here by gentlemen with respect to the markets; that the Islington Market should be only for the London purchasers.

5897. You are referring, I presume, to Mr. Gebhardt's suggestion, that the Islington Market should be a market simply for the slaughter of fat animals?—Yes.

5898. What is your opinion upon that point?—I heard a witness state that the Metropolitan Market is the hotbed of disease, because cattle are brought from all parts of the country and mixed together there. I think that there cannot be more hotbeds in London than there are in the country, because the majority of the cattle are brought from the various fairs and markets in the country, and therefore they would have the same chance of contracting disease there as they would have in London, provided there was any contagious disease in existence.

5899. The object of Mr. Gebhardt's suggestion, as I understood, was that he was then talking of what he called the hotbeds of disease, which were the dairy-sheds of London, and the opportunity which was afforded of spreading disease in the country, because wherever disease broke out in one of those sheds as he stated, the chance was that the animals in contact were sent into the Islington Market, were bought by jobbers there, and carried from there with the possibility of an additional profit of 1 *s.* or 2 *s.*, into the markets around London, and thus were distributed and became centres of disease; and his suggestion was that, whilst not stopping the trade for slaughter throughout the country, he would absolutely prevent Islington being anything but a fat cattle market?—But you would have the same chance of disease by cattle coming from the country as by cows from the dairy-sheds in London.

5900. All that you would do, according to Mr. Gebhardt's suggestion, seems to me that you would prevent their becoming stock, and their being distributed as such throughout the country; but when they came there they might be taken anywhere, so long as it was for slaughter alone?—I believe that Mr. Gebhardt was alluding to cattle only being killed in London.

5901. I think you mistake Mr. Gebhardt's evidence; his evidence was that he would restrict the Islington Market to a slaughter market; that is to say, that an animal, when once there, should only leave the market for the purpose of slaughter?—Certainly; I agree with that.

5902. And that an animal should not be taken by a jobber from the Islington Market to another

Mr. *Pool.*

20 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

market at Romford, or wherever it might be, and there sold in the open market, being there placed in contact with animals, fat as well as store, and thus distributing the disease throughout the country?—Certainly; that is my opinion as well.

5903. And you think that that would be an improvement upon the present state of things?—It would certainly be an improvement, because it has always been my opinion, and I have expressed it to the authorities of the market, that it should not be a store market connected with the fat market.

5904. And that they should not be allowed to go from there to any other market, where they would be placed in contact with store animals?—Certainly.

5905. But if they were bought for the purpose of slaughter, they might be taken to any town where the supply was wanted?—Yes; I have had some experience of the London cowsheds, and I think that the ideas are rather over-estimated in reference te their being hotbeds of disease.

5906. I suppose that a large portion of the supply of cows to the London dairies is brought from Holland?—Certainly a large supply, but a great many go into the country.

5907. You are aware that the Netherlands have, perhaps more than any other country, been subject to pleuro-pneumonia?—I do not know that they have been subject to it more than any other country; I cannot say that I can agree to that, because I have seen a great deal of it in England.

5908. We have figures before us, put in by the Consul General for the Netherlands, which show that pleuro-pneumonia exists to a very large extent among the stock in that country?—I am not acquainted with the statistics.

5909. If that is so, there is considerable danger of pleuro-pneumonia being introduced into the dairy-sheds of London from that source alone, is there not?—They are not imported as fat cattle, and they are not sold in the market amongst the fat stock.

5910. But they come into the London dairy-sheds?—Yes; but a large quantity of the Dutch cattle go into the country as well.

5911. I am asking you about what you wished to mention to the Committee, and that is, with regard to your idea that the dairy-sheds in London are not a source of disease?—I do not think they are.

5912. On that, I ask you whether you are not aware that the dairy-sheds of London are largely supplied by cows coming from the Netherlands?—Yes; I say they are, but the country is supplied at the same time.

5913. That being so, I then ask you whether you are aware that pleuro-pneumonia is a disease that has not been stamped out in the Netherlands, and that consequently the dairy-sheds are liable to have pleuro-pneumonia brought into them by these Dutch cows?—I do not think that they would stand any more risk of having it brought in by having the cows from the Netherlands than from any part of the United Kingdom.

5914. If there is that risk from cows from the United Kingdom or from Holland, what restrictions are there to protect the people from

Chairman—continued.

the spread of that disease by the animals being sent into the Islington Market as soon as it is found out that they are not well?—I should legislate for that if there is any fear of contagion. I do not believe that pleuro-pneumonia is contagious; but if you should think that it is contagious, I certainly should legislate for it, and not have them brought to any market.

5915. Do you think that it would be wise that no animal should be allowed to leave one of those dairy-sheds unless it was inspected?—That might be done to a certain extent; that might be a great assistance.

5916. And that thus you might prevent what has been suggested as the danger, which is, that when an animal was found to be ill in a dairy-shed, the animals in immediate contact with it were at once sent into the market and got rid of?—Probably that you might; but I do not think that pleuro-pneumonia is contagious for all that.

5917. Are you a veterinary surgeon?—I am not, but I have had a great deal of experience with the lung complaint, and also with the foot-and-mouth disease. I have had a great many cattle in my hands, and I have sold nearly 100 fat cattle from my farm since last November.

5918. Have you had experience of pleuro-pneumonia on your farm?—I am very pleased to say that I have not during the last two or three years.

5919. Have you had it sufficiently to enable you to speak from experience as to the contagion or the want of contagion in the disease?—I have had sufficient experience to enable me to say with certainty that I do not think it is contagious. I had, some years ago, a place in London where I used to have a man placed to sell milk, and I have sometimes, like other people, been so unfortunate as to have cows taken with the lung complaint, but I have never considered that it is a contagious disease. They have generally been slaughtered if they have been in a condition to be fit for human food.

5920. You mean to say that you had pleuro-pneumonia in your sheds, and that some of your animals were condemned for pleuro-pneumonia and slaughtered?—No, they were not condemned.

5921. There was no inspection?—No, there was no inspection.

5922. Did you send any of your animals, then, into the market?—I generally used to send them to the butchers to be slaughtered, and sell them if they were fit for human food; it would depend upon the condition of the animal whether it was fit for human food or not.

5923. Having had what you believed to be pleuro-pneumonia in your herd, did you find that it did not spread to other animals?—Certainly.

5924. From that you would argue that pleuro-pneumonia is not a contagious disease?—I believe it is not.

5925. Notwithstanding the experience of all the veterinary surgeons in the world to the contrary?—I have never heard the opinion expressed by the Veterinary Department, or by any veterinary surgeon that it was contagious.

5926. Are you aware that we have had it in evidence before this Committee, that it is absolutely infectious?—It is infectious, but not contagious

Chairman—continued.

contagious. I am speaking about its being contagious.

5927. I am not quite aware what you mean by contagion then?—The contagion that I am alluding to is this: supposing that you have a herd of cattle where the rinderpest may take place, of course you might naturally suppose that you would lose the whole lot; but if have 50 or 100 cattle on your farm, and one or two fall ill with the foot-and-mouth disease or with the lung complaint, there is no reason why any more should fall ill with the same complaint.

5928. You mean to say from your practical knowledge, and from your veterinary knowledge, that if you had pleuro-pneumonia in your herd, you would allow the other animals to remain with the animals that were affected with the disease?—I would not.

5929. You have some dread of pleuro-pneumonia, then?—It may be some time before it is discovered; it is not generally discovered in the first stage; it may be discovered in the first stage or it may not; it all depends upon circumstances, and upon the condition in which the animal is.

Mr. *M'Lagan.*

5930. I think you stated that you were a practical farmer?—Only upon a small scale.

5931. And you are a cattle salesman to whom cattle have been consigned, both from this country and abroad?—Yes.

5932. And you are also a commission agent to whom dead meat is consigned?—Yes; that is not my general business, but I have undertaken that on account of doing business with the gentlemen in the live trade.

5933. As regards your business as a practical farmer, what is the extent of your farm?—It is only 150 acres.

5934. Do you keep many cattle upon it?—I do sometimes; sometimes I have a great many.

5935. Is it principally in grass?—There are 20 acres of arable land, and the rest is all grass.

5936. Therefore you depend very much upon the grazing?—We do not in general, because we generally make the hay first.

5937. Therefore you have very few cattle upon your farm?—I think I have in proportion to the acreage; I think I have at times a good many; sometimes I have 100 or 150 of various sorts by me.

5938. Are they fed by the hay from your farm?—They are fed upon the hay from my farm, and mangolds, and distillers' grains; we purchase food.

5939. And you keep those cattle, perhaps, only two or three months on your farm, I suppose?—No; I have some which I have had by me upon my farm, for the last two or three years.

5940. How do you keep them in the summer?—After we have made the hay we turn them out. They do not go out to grass, except that I have few pedigree animals, and those we generally have a field for and do the best we possibly can with, until such time as the grass fails.

5941. But your cattle are principally kept in court-yards, I understand?—In sheds.

Mr. *M'Lagan*—continued.

5942. And therefore, as they are not going about, they are not so liable to infectious or contagious diseases, as if they went into the fields?—They go into the fields from about the end of July until about the end of the year, or as long as the weather permits.

5943. And you have only had pleuro-pneumonia once upon your farm?—I cannot say that I have had it once. I said that I experienced it. It was in reference to my London sheds. I might have had it in my farm too, for aught I know. We know that the animal goes back so quickly when it is affected with that disease that if it is fit for human food we generally dispose of it.

5944. Then you are in this advantageous position, that when you see an animal the least ailing, you take the precaution of sending it at once to the market?—That is so.

5945. Whether it be pleuro-pneumonia, rinderpest, or any other disease, you get quit of it at once?—That all depends upon circumstances.

5946. I thought you said so?—I have some valuable stock at my farm now, some pedigree stock, and if I thought there was anything amiss with them I should certainly not send them away without trying first to see what was the matter with them, whereas if it was an ordinary fat animal, which was fit for the market, I should certainly send it away directly if it was unwell.

5947. You take care that the disease shall not be so far developed but that you could tell whether it was pleuro-pneumonia or rinderpest. In fact, from being a cattle salesman, you have an advantage in disposing of those cattle which an ordinary farmer has not?—I do not dispose of any diseased animals.

5948. I should not call it diseased if the disease was not developed?—I do not sell any animal which is known to be affected with any disease, or which is supposed to be diseased.

5949. But if the disease is not developed?—Then I should be placed in the same position as a farmer, because a farmer may send his cattle to market in that event.

5950. Have you not, as a farmer, considered what would be the effect upon your cattle of having diseased cattle, either home cattle or foreign cattle, travelling along the roads near your farm?—I should not have any fear of cattle passing my farm or travelling on the high roads if they are affected either with lung disease or foot-and-mouth disease.

5951. Have you never heard from your communications with farmers that very often cattle that are feeding in fields are infected, particularly with foot-and-mouth disease, by cattle passing along the road?—There have been such cases reported, but it is my firm belief that foot-and-mouth disease is atmospheric.

5952. You do not believe in the contagious nature of it?—I do not.

5953. You have generally a very large number of cattle consigned to you from abroad, from Schleswig-Holstein, from Denmark, and from Germany?—From various parts.

5954. What number of cattle do you have?—Sometimes I have as many as 400 or 500 a week.

5955. And, therefore, we may argue from that that your trade in that particular branch would be

Mr. *Pool.*

20 June 1877.

Mr. *Pool.*

20 June 1877.

Mr. *M'Lagan*—continued.

be considerably affected if the import of those cattle were prohibited?—It would affect me as much as it would anyone else.

5956. It would affect you as an individual?—It would affect me as an individual in so far as that, if the importation were not to come, I should have just to keep to my farm or I should have to go into the meat market.

5957. But you would rather that the cattle did come, and that you should have your commission upon them?—I certainly would not allow the cattle to come if there was any contagious disease.

5958. But you would rather that sound cattle should come to you, and that you should get your commission upon them?—It is natural that I should, as anyone would in his business. I have the same interest in my business as a farmer has in his.

5959. I should have the same feeling myself if I were in your position; I should not like them to be prohibited either. But in that case you would think that any legislation, whether good or bad for the country, would not be so good for you if it prohibited those cattle from coming?—Speaking as an individual, it would not; but I do not believe that legislation is made for individual parties; I believe that it is made for the good of the general public.

5960. As regards the dead meat, I think you said that all the experience that you have had was from August to November?—From August to November.

5961. You had no consignments before that?—No, nor yet since; but I have seen the meat.

5962. So far as I understand your evidence, all the consignments which you have had amounted to 92,000 stone, of which only about 3,680 stone, or less than 4 per cent., was condemned?—I think it is plenty too.

5963. Do you not think that that was a very small proportion to have condemned?—I do not think you would think so if you had to send it to London, and I do not think so.

5964. Taking almost any business in the importation of a perishable article like beef, do you not think that 4 or 5 per cent. is a small proportion to go wrong on such a long voyage as that from America to this country?—If the profits were large in accordance, it might not be a large per-centage, but there is a great deterioration in the meat itself from the time it is shipped until the time of its arrival. Besides that, the figures which I have given you only represent the weight which I have received. I do not know the weight which has been shipped, only I have heard that the deterioration during the transit is at times very great; in fact Mr. Gillett has said so himself.

5965. Is there not also a deterioration both in the weight and also in the quality of live cattle coming over?—Not so much, I think, as in the dead meat.

5966. Is there not considerable deterioration?—Not so much.

5967. Is it not so great from many cattle dying and being good for nothing whatever?—That all depends upon the season of the year in which they are brought over.

5968. The loss in the dead meat imported depends, upon the season of the year too?—Probably it may be so, but a portion of this meat has come in October and November.

Mr. *M'Lagan*—continued.

5969. Part of it came in August, and perhaps the worst keeping months of the year are August and September?—Yes; June, July, August, and September.

5970. Therefore your experience of the importation of dead meat includes two months of the worst keeping season of the year?—There are four months; there are June and July as well; I believe those are considered two of the worst months.

5971. You say that you do not think that this trade of the importation of dead meat will go on increasing?—I cannot say that it will, and I cannot say that it will not; it all depends upon prices. If prices go up in the United States, and if freights advance, naturally, unless prices went up in England, the people could not send it, assuming the statement to be correct that 6 *d.* per lb. will remunerate them, and they have not made 6 *d.* per lb. yet.

5972. Have you heard the evidence which has been given in this Committee-room, that there are sufficient cattle in America to allow this trade to go on increasing without much raising the price in America?—I have heard it, but I am also in a position to state that since last year the price of cattle has risen considerably in America.

5973. You are aware that for some years there has been in America a very large increase of grazing cattle in Colorado and the other grazing districts?—I have heard it stated.

5974. And that to such an extent was the number of cattle increased, that, the price of beef was very much lowered, and though when the importation of dead meat to this country commenced, it raised the price of meat in America, yet that there are a very large number of cattle still ready to be imported into England without a still further rise in America?—It may be so, but I could not say.

5975. Supposing, then, that the price of beef does rise in America, what would be the effect in America; would it not be that the farmers would go on increasing the number of their cattle?—Certainly.

5976. Therefore, if the price rises there, the number of cattle will be increased?—Certainly.

5977. And, therefore, we need not fear any diminution in the number of cattle coming over to this country, even if the price in America should rise?—If the price increases in America it will only depend upon the English markets. If there was not an increase in the price in the English market, they could not expect an increase in the price in America.

5978. But supposing that there is an increase of price in this country, and an increase of price in America, the effect of that would be to make the farmers in America increase the numbers of cattle, will it not?—Certainly.

5979. And, therefore, considering the great resources for breeding cattle in America, we need not look for any great increase in the price of beef in America?—It may not be so; I cannot say.

5980. Evidence has been given in this Committee-room of the impossibility of bringing dead meat from the Continent; are you of opinion that it is impossible to bring dead meat from the Continent

Mr. *M'Lagan*—continued.

Continent in the same way as it is brought from America?—I believe it is.

5981. Will you give your reason for that?—It is because I believe that the distance is not far enough from England, and that the prices of meat are considerably higher in Holland, Germany, and other parts of the Continent, in comparison to what they are in America. Although the Continent is so much nearer England, the freights from the Continent are, in proportion, higher than, or as high as, they are from the United States. Then in America they have a facility of getting everything for the preparation, which I do not think they possess on the Continent. I have known an instance of 90 carcase of oxen arriving here from America; 50 tons of ice were required to preserve them previously to shipment, and 50 tons were required during the transit, making 100 tons for 90 carcases of cattle; consequently the amount of ice necessary for shipping 4,000 or 5,000 head of cattle and 10,000 sheep would be so large that I should not think that it is possible to procure it in those parts of the Continent. Besides that there are the preparations; they have no accommodation for slaughter at the Continental ports, and it would tend, as I have already stated, to stop the breeding of cattle, because they would be the losers of the entire offal, for which they have no market over there. Speaking in particular for those parts of Germany which you have alluded to, from which the Touning cattle come, of course they have no sale, and they would lose the entire offal. They could not import it, or at least it has never been tried, and I should not think the importation of meat from those ports could take place, because Ireland, which sends a large importation of meat during the winter, does not send any in the summer to the London market, and therefore I compare one with the other.

5982. Do you suppose that because Ireland does not send dead meat in summer Germany could not send it?—No; I should say that they could not send it.

5983. You say that one of the great difficulties is the want of ice?—The want of ice, and the disposal of the offal, and the want of preparations.

5984. Are you aware that at the present time there are refrigerating apparatus which can produce any amount of cold you want without any ice whatever?—I am not aware of it. I have told you about the experiment that one firm in New York have made by sending two consignments of meat without ice, and both of those failed.

5985. But although they failed once it does not follow that they will always fail?—It is to be hoped not.

5986. Have you never heard that there are apparatus by which you can produce 5 or 10 tons of ice in 24 hours?—I am not acquainted with it.

5987. Therefore, if that were brought to any perfection, you would be able to dispense with the use of ice altogether in bringing the meat from the Continent?—If that were the case you might.

5988. The next point was as to the disposal of the offal; what do the poor people on the Continent live on at the present time; do they never live on offal?—They do; but they could not consume the quantity.

Mr. *M'Lagan*—continued.

5989. Have you never heard of how the offals are disposed of in South America and other places?—I have.

5990. Do you think that the same practices could not be adopted in places like Schleswig-Holstein?—I do not think so, because they have a larger population in America to consume the offal.

5991. From your practical experience, what is the value of the offal?—It varies at different times.

5992. What is the average price?—There is the hide, for instance, which is considered a portion of the offal; it varies from 15*s.* to 3*l.* For instance, a cow's hide would only fetch 15*s.*, whereas the hide of an ox imported from Spain, or particularly from Portugal, would make 3*l.*, being of a superior kind. Then there are the head, the feet, the tripe, the liver, the heart, the tongue, the tail, and the fat, which are worth more or less, according to circumstances.

5993. What would all those come to?—The whole amount for the head, the feet, the tripe, the liver, and the heart, would be 12*s.*; for the tongue and the tail 5*s.*; and the fat averaging from 10*s.* to 30*s.*

5994. Is there any difficulty whatever in disposing of the hide on the Continent; could they not put up tanneries there as well as in this country?—There are some. Probably there might not be any difficulty about the hide, but it all depends upon whether the same price could be obtained.

5995. They might perhaps turn it into leather, and send the leather over to this country?—I am not acquainted with that.

5996. The next thing is the tongue; we have a large importation of salted tongues to this country; could not they salt the tongues there?—I daresay everything could be done at a sacrifice; but that, in my opinion, would tend to stop the supply.

5997. The loss would come to a few shillings; at all events, the tongue and the other parts could be preserved and sent to this country, or to other large consuming countries, and therefore the loss from the offal would not be so great?—The loss from the offal according to that would be only 12*s.*

5998. And you might reduce it to 5*s.* perhaps, by pickling the tongues and other parts?—That is exclusive of the tongues. The articles which could not be preserved, I think, amount to 12*s.* on an average in London. It would be a loss to the poor people of London.

5999. I thought you were speaking of the loss to the importer?—There are thousands of people in London, as is well known, who live upon this offal. It would also be a loss to the importers to a certain extent, if they could not turn it into money.

6000. If the poor people in London did not get that they would get beef instead?—If it were within their reach; if the price would permit it.

6001. I understood you to say that these cattle would not be imported into this country on account of the dead meat coming in from America at a low price?—I do not remember having said so; I said that it was on account of the restric-

Mr. *Pool.*

20 June 1877.

Mr. *Pool.*

20 June 1877.

Mr. *M'Lagan*—continued.

tions, and their not meeting with free trade and an open market.

6002. Would you maintain that cattle should be allowed to be imported into this country from all countries?—Certainly from those which are free from disease.

6003. Would you maintain the restrictions which the Privy Council have at the present time?—No.

6004. Do you think that they are too severe?—No, I cannot say that they are too severe; they are too severe to a certain extent. For instance, I think that there should not be this prohibition in the case of a country like Schleswig-Holstein, where there is no disease known.

6005. But they are allowed to come in?—Only into Deptford Market. I would have them come into London, to a free trade and to a free market. According to my opinion, and according to a letter which was received this morning from Schleswig-Holstein, there is not the slightest doubt that if cattle have to be sent to the Deptford Market (which will not suit the importer, and particularly under the restrictions, because they have not the chance of a fair and open run of trade), they will send their cattle to France and other parts, and they are now under treaty for sending cattle over to France, because cattle at the present time are making as much in France as they do in London.

6006. It would depend upon the price of the meat; if they could get more profit in France they would send it there?—Certainly; but this country would lose the supply.

6007. If the price got higher they would still continue to send the cattle here, would they not?—I suppose that they would send it to the best market, there is no doubt about that.

6008. Then do you advocate the doing away with the Deptford Market altogether?—I certainly would, because I would not allow any cattle to be imported from any country that is affected, and because I do not think that Deptford Market is a preventive of the introduction of any infectious disease. If it is true, as we have heard, that sheep can carry the disease, and that a human being can carry the disease, if such disease is in existence, I should think that the Government would require to disinfect every human being that comes to Deptford Market, and every horse and cart, every officer, and every steamer, and every sailor who is in contact with the cattle.

6009. Then I understand your opinion to be this: that you approve of the restrictions of the Privy Council at the present time, with this exception, that you would do away with the Deptford Market?—I would, certainly. That is my recommendation, because I would not import cattle from a place where there was any suspicion of infection.

Mr. *Torr.*

6010. You alluded, I think, to a rise in the price of cattle in America since the export of meat took place?—Since last year.

6011. Do you know that as a fact?—I do.

6012. In what market in America was that?—I have had the information from a gentleman who is at the present moment shipping a cargo of cattle to England *viâ* New York from St. Louis.

Mr. *Torr*—continued.

6013. I asked you whether you knew it to be a fact of your own knowledge that cattle had advanced in price in the New York market?—From what a gentleman told me they have. He sent two consignments over in the month of May, he has gone back, and he tells me that since he was there last year the prices have certainly risen in America. That is the information which I have.

6014. Do you know that a very large proportion of the cattle which are sent to this country in the way of dead meat comes from Chicago?—I do not know that so much comes from Chicago as from New York.

1015. But it is at Chicago that the cattle are bought?—Yes; and cattle are brought from St. Louis, which is even farther than Chicago.

6016. Do you know that the cattle in Chicago have not advanced in price?—I can only give you the information which I have received.

Mr. *Dease.*

6017. Are you aware that it has been stated in evidence before this Committee that the wholesale price of meat in New York is about 4½ *d.* per lb.?—I have not heard anything in reference to the wholesale price.

6918. Have you ever heard what is the retail price of meat in New York?—I have not.

6019. Have you ever heard of the retail price amounting to 9 *d.* per lb.?—I may have heard it, but I cannot speak with certainty as to that.

6020. Supposing the wholesale price at New York to be 4 *d.* per lb. and the retail price to be 9 *d.* per lb., would it not appear that there would be a considerable profit to the exporter on sending meat over to Europe?—I should not say that there would be a considerable profit; because, if it cost 4½ *d.* per lb., and the expenses are 1½ *d.* per lb., that makes 6 *d.*; and consequently they must make more than 6 *d.* per lb. to make it pay. Whereas, if the cattle cost the same price as meat, cattle would naturally make more in this country; and this would, according to my opinion, forward the trade to a very great extent; because every ounce of meat when live cattle come could be consumed, whereas, of the meat imported, at times large quantities are unfit for human food.

6021. Still, though large quantities may have been affected in coming over, we know that a very much larger quantity has been sold in our markets, and has been found most excellent?—Probably it might. Some of it has arrived in good condition, and some has not.

6022. In the same way some of the live cattle have been thrown overboard, and there has been a loss incurred in that way, has there not?—Not in proportion. It is only at certain times of the year that you can ship live cattle. I think that after the month of August or September no one would bring any live cattle, because I believe the risk would be so great. At those times they might probably ship larger quantities of meat.

Mr. *Murphy.*

6023. I think you said that, if the supply of American meat continues uninterruptedly, the continental imports would probably cease?—I do not think I said so.

6024. If

Mr. *Murphy*—continued.

6024. If the supply of American meat was so unlimited as to bring the price below what would pay the continental importer, would not the desire on the part of the continental importer to send his beasts here be less?—It would, certainly.

6025. You think, of course, that the competition is necessary to keep prices down?—Competition and free trade.

6026. Are you aware how many foreign beasts are imported into England in the course of the year?—I cannot tell you how many foreign beasts are imported into England in the course of the year; I have heard it stated, but I have kept no record of it.

6027. Taking it for granted that the supply in America is practically unlimited, and also that the prices of meat in America rise, as they have risen according to your statement, would not the effect be merely this: that the profit to the American exporter would be less than it is now, but that still he would have such a profit as to induce him to continue his exportation?—Certainly, he would have less profit unless the market were to rise here.

6028. But still, the supply being unlimited, he would have, nevertheless, a sufficient profit to induce him to send his dead meat here?—No doubt, if he has a profit, he might continue to do so.

6029. With reference to your idea that the importations of dead meat is a loss, how do you account for the fact, that in the month of November 1875, there were but 36,000 lbs. of American dead meat imported into this country; and that in the month of March 1877, there were between 6,000,000 lbs. and 7,000,000 lbs. of dead meat imported?—I did not say that it was a loss. I said that, according to the statement which had been given here, 6 *d.* per pound was a remunerative price; and that as the 4,266 quarters of beef which I have had through my hands, averaged 4¾ *d.* per lb., therefore that would not be a profit. I could not say anything more about the American beef being a loss; I only speak of the consignments to myself.

6030. Do you mean to give that as an instance of what the general effect of the importation of dead meat from America is?—I mean to give it as an instance of what it has been so far, because I believe there has been no particular time when they have made 6 *d.* or more.

6031. Then are we to understand from you that the instance which you have given as to the quantity that came under your knowledge as producing 4¾ *d.* per pound was an exceptional case, or do you give it as an instance of the general effect of the importation of dead meat from America?—Of the general importation of dead meat.

6032. Do you give that 4¾ *d.* per pound which you got, and which came under your knowledge as an instance of the general effect of the American importation of dead meat?—Of course, I must give it so, because I believe that the meat generally comes in the same condition as this arrived in.

6033. Do you consider that a year and a half, from October 1875 to March 1877, is a fair time for the experiment, and is sufficient to give people who are engaged in the American dead meat trade, a fair knowledge of what the future probabilities of the trade are?—I should think so.

Mr. *Murphy*—continued.

6034. And therefore, the trade having increased, that knowledge and experience of a year and a half ought to be a fair ground for forming a guess, if I may call it so, as to whether the trade would probably continue?—That all depends upon circumstances. It depends upon whether the price of meat in America continues or whether the price of meat in England will go higher or lower. It depends upon the market. But in reference to my opinion as to whether any improvement has been made in the shipment of the meat, I must say that, from the period over which the experiments have extended, I should think they have gained sufficient experience to know whether any improvement could be made or not.

Mr. *King Harman*.

6035. You say you do not think that either rinderpest or pleuro-pneumonia is contagious?—I do not.

6036. But you think that they are atmospheric?—I think that foot-and-mouth disease is atmospheric; I did not say that rinderpest was.

6037. You think that rinderpest is contagious?—Certainly.

6038. Do you think that there is any other disease, except rinderpest, that is contagious amongst cattle?—I cannot say.

6039. You stated that you would recommend that the import of cattle should be free from all countries in which there was not contagious disease; do you mean to recommend that the import of cattle should be free from every country in which there was not distinctly known to be rinderpest?—Certainly, or any other contagious disease which may exist, if there is any, I cannot tell that.

6040. But you do not include pleuro-pneumonia?—Certainly not.

6041. Nor foot-and-mouth disease?—Certainly not.

6042. Nor sheep-pox?—I have not sufficient experience to talk about sheep.

6043. Would you say that glanders was contagious?—We have not got that amongst cattle; I have heard of it amongst horses, but I have not sufficient experience of it.

6044. Do you think that scab is contagious?—I have not sufficient experience of sheep to enable me to give an opinion.

6045. You say that you lost 4 per cent. on some dead-meat cargoes which you imported, and you look upon that as a very heavy loss?—I do not think that my statement is thoroughly understood; this is a dead loss of 3,680 stone, from which the owner or the public does not receive any benefit.

6046. I put it as a dead loss; I do not mean to go into the question of deterioration at all, I am talking of 4 per cent. dead loss, and you think that a large per-centage?—I should think so if I had to ship meat to England.

6047. Would you be surprised to hear that, by the Return of 1876, it appears that 7½ per cent. of the cattle alone (without speaking of sheep), were thrown overboard, or died either on board or on landing?—Probably that might be for a whole year, but this experiment is only for two months.

6048. It does not matter whether it is for a year or for a century, the percentage is the same;

Mr. *Pool.*

20 June 1877.

Mr. *King Harman*—continued.

you consider that four per cent. is a very large dead loss on dead meat; I say, should you be surprised to learn that 7½ per cent. was the dead loss from throwing overboard live cattle, and from deaths from exhaustion, and so on, in 1876?—Certainly; but although the percentage may be the same, there is a certain time of the year in which you cannot import live cattle. The quantity of meat of which I spoke, came in the months from the 22nd of August to the 16th of November; supposing that the same quantity, or larger quantities had arrived in the month of June or July, probably the percentage might have been larger then; but I can only go upon the facts which I have before me.

Chairman.

6049. On what you have before you, the fact is, that the loss has been 4 per cent., whereas on what is absolutely before the public, the loss on the live trade is 7½ per cent?—That may be so.

Mr. *King Harman.*

6050. Do you think that the fact of our excluding live foreign cattle from our markets would materially lower the price of meat in the large foreign towns, say in Paris?—It might, if a larger proportion was imported than their consumption required; but in reference to any restrictions upon importation, I think they would tend to stop farmers breeding cattle for the purpose of export.

6051. Do you believe that the fact of Great Britain excluding foreign cattle from its ports, would materially lower the price of meat in the large foreign meat consuming towns, and particularly in Paris?—I think it would.

6052. Materially?—I cannot say that it would materially; it all depends upon circumstances.

6053. You can speak as a practical man?—If the importations from various parts of the Continent found their way to other markets, and if the supply was more than their trade required, naturally prices would go down, but I could not say to what extent they might go down.

6054. If the prices in the large foreign meat consuming towns went down, would not that very much tend to drive the producer into seeking a dead-meat market in England?—No, I do not think that they could carry it out.

6055. That is a matter of opinion?—That is my opinion.

6056. But he would naturally be inclined to try back to his old market in the best way he could get to it if he lost his price in the new one?—He might do so until he found which was most beneficial to his interest.

6057. You stated that you had seen American meat arrive in the same ship, some of it in good condition, and some of it in bad condition, on what principle was that meat sent over?—On the usual system, by placing it within the refrigerator surrounded with ice.

6058. Could you give the name of the ship or of the shipper, and the dates?—Yes, I can give the particulars; I have them here from the salesman in the Metropolitan Meat Market. I have the price, the weight of every identical article, the name of the ship, and the date when it was sold. I have the accounts which I can show you; some of it I believe, was sold as low as 1 *s.* and also 8 *d.* a stone.

Chairman.

6059. Were you certain that it was part of the same cargo?—There was no other; it was all to the same consignee.

6060. Did the whole consignment come out of that one vessel?—There was no other shipper in that vessel; he was the only shipper in that vessel.

6061. Can you absolutely state, of your own personal knowledge, that this consignment came to you from one individual, in one cargo, which was treated in exactly the same way?—I have the sale-accounts of the whole cargo which was in the ship at the time. They will give you the full particulars, and there was no more meat in the same ship when she arrived.

6062. That would make it conclusive that it was the same meat?—That would make it conclusive that it was the same meat and the same ship, and there was no other meat in the ship but that meat.

6063. You are prepared to state that part of that consignment arrived in a condition to fetch a good price, and part to fetch a bad price?—Yes. (*The Witness handed in the Statement to the Chairman.*)

6064. This shows that there was a fluctuation in the trade; that is to say, that at one time there was a greater quantity on sale, and that therefore the price was reduced; but it does not show conclusively that it arose from the quality of the meat?—This arose particularly from the bad condition of the meat.

6065. What was the name of the ship?—I can give you the name of the ship; I believe it was the "Australia."

6066. Are you able to speak from your own personal knowledge as to whether the cargo, which came over in the "Australia," came over in one refrigerator or in a refrigerator which was divided into compartments?—In one refrigerator.

Mr. *Chamberlain.*

6067. Have you had any experience of the trade in sheep?—My experience in sheep is not much.

6068. I understood you to say that if the live cattle trade with the Continent of Europe were prohibited, you do not think that the dead-meat trade would be substituted for it?—I do not.

6069. Do you get that information from the shippers?—From the farmers in general, and from the shippers too.

6070. You think that they would prefer to send their live cattle to other countries?—They would certainly prefer to send them to the best market; but it is my firm belief that they would ultimately go back to their old system of farming which was in use previously to the importation.

Colonel *Kingscote.*

6071. Where is your farm situated?—In the county of Middlesex, in the parish of Edmonton, near Southgate.

Mr. *Arthur Peel.*

6072. You would abolish the Deptford Market?—I certainly would.

6073. Would you abolish the Deptford Market because you think that a dead-meat market is no security against foreign disease, or because you

Mr. *Arthur Peel*—continued.

you think that Deptford is not a free market?—I would abolish the Deptford Market, because I do not think it is a free market, and because I do not think that it is a safeguard against the importation of disease.

6074. Why is it not a free market?—Because we do not get the attendance of the butchers in general; we are dependent upon only a few purchasers. The largest number, I think, would not exceed 30, whereas in the other market we have as many hundreds.

6075. You think that the retail butchers in the Deptford Market are in the hands of a few large people?—There are no retail butchers in the Deptford Market. The importer is in the hands of a few large people.

6076 I understood you to say that the small butchers had no sheds in the Deptford Market?—They have no slaughter-houses there.

6077. Do you think that, in consequence of the artificial restriction of competition in the Deptford Market the prices to the consumer are enhanced?—No; the price to the importer is reduced.

6078. Then you are in favour, in short, of free import?—I am in favour of a free import.

6079. And you do not care whether it is dead or alive?—I do not care whether it is dead or alive; and I am in favour of free import certainly.

6080. You were asked if you were not afraid of a glut in the market; I suppose you are not at all afraid of a glut in the market?—I certainly should be afraid of a glut of dead meat in the market, because if, for instance, you have the same quantity imported dead as is now imported alive from all countries, during a certain time of the year, there would be such a glut in the market that it would be impossible for it to be disposed of, because it is not an article which could be kept, whereas the live animals can be kept until such time as the trade demands their slaughter.

6081. Of course, if the market was glutted, people would take care not to send the meat in such large quantities?—Yes, but you could not avoid it.

6082. The Chairman pressed you very closely and very fairly as to a statement which you made; he asked you whether it was possible that if the dead-meat trade had been unremunerative for so many years, it should still go on increasing in such large quantities?—I do not know that it has been going on increasing for so many years.

6083. You distinctly said so yourself; the Chairman asked you whether you knew of any other trade which was not remunerative, and which still went on in increasingly large proportions year after year?—I was under the impression that the Chairman was alluding to the American dead-meat trade.

6084. I am speaking of that; is it your opinion that a great number of people have embarked in that trade, and that the loss which exists has consequently been distributed over a greater number of people than before?—If there is any loss, naturally it would be so.

6085. Would that be any explanation of the fact of the trade continuing, notwithstanding the loss?—I go by what the American gentleman has stated, that 6 *d.* per pound would pay them; and whereas the 4,000 quarters of beef which I have had only realised about 4½ *d.* per pound; of course, naturally, it could not remunerate them.

Mr. *Arthur Peel*—continued.

6086. There are more people competing and more people speculating?—There are more people competing, and more people speculating, and more people getting into the practice of exporting meat. It is naturally done for the sake of gain, whether it is for the purpose of getting a profit upon the meat, or whether it is for the purpose of selling their patents.

6087. Are all the processes under which the meat is brought patents?—Yes; I believe there are various kinds.

6088. In short, they are competing for the prize, and they can stand an intermediate loss?—I have heard so.

6089. What, in your opinion, is the lowest price at which it would be remunerative to introduce dead meat from America?—I cannot tell; I have heard it stated here that it is 6 *d.* per pound.

6090. Is it, or is it not, your opinion that that is a remunerative price?—I cannot say.

6091. What price do you think would be remunerative?—I am not acquainted with it; I know the expense of the preparation.

6092. But you do not know of your own knowledge what is the lowest remunerative price at which American meat could be sold in this country?—No, I do not; I have heard it stated that it is 6 *d.* per pound.

6093. Can you state what is the average price of American meat?—I could not say from my own knowledge, but only from hearsay; I understand that it does not make 6 *d.* per pound.

6094. If the freight rose from 30 *s.* a ton to 50 *s.* a ton, I suppose that would have a very large effect upon the price of the meat?—I do not say that; I do not suppose that a rise of 1 *l.* per ton in the freight would have that effect, although the rise in the freight and the rise in the price on the Continent combined might do so. Of course an increase of 1 *l.* a ton in the freight could not make such a material difference. You must take everything into consideration. I said that, taking the freight into consideration, if the freight rose from 30 *s.* to 50 *s.*, as it was in 1873, and if the price of meat, both in this country and America rose, then, in my opinion, they could not go on sending dead meat from America.

6095. If the freight rose from 30 *s.* a ton to 50 *s.* a ton, in your opinion might not that dislocate all the conditions under which the meat trade is now a success?—I do not think that a rise in the freight of 20 *s.* per ton would affect it so much.

Mr. *Chaplin.*

6096. In reference to the consignments of meat from America of which you speak, you told us that some of the meat was bad from imperfect preparation, and that some of it was bad without any cause?—As to some of it they could not give an explanation.

6097. When was the meat that was bad without any apparent cause first found to be bad; was it immediately on the arrival of the ship?—Certainly, because the refrigerator is not opened till then.

6098. I assume that sometimes it must be opened, because we have heard of meat being thrown

Mr. *Pool.*

20 June 1877.

Mr. *Pool.*

20 June 1877.

Mr. *Chaplin*—continued.

thrown overboard during the journey?—Then the entire lot is spoilt; but the refrigerator is is not opened until the meat is taken out.

6099. You told us that some meat in some of your consignments was found to be bad, and that no cause could be assigned for it; was the whole of that cargo bad?—No; only a portion of it. There have been no whole cargoes bad to my knowledge, except those 24 quarters which were tried on a new experiment, and which were thrown overboard.

6100. I understand that your great objection to the dead-meat trade is the difficulty in the distribution of the meat to the consumers throughout the country?—I am not against the dead-meat trade.

6101. I understood you to say just now, in answer to a question which was put to you by the Member for Birmingham, that your great objection to the trade in meat (but confined entirely to dead meat) would be the difficulty in

Mr. *Chaplin*—continued.

distributing it?—Certainly; as regards the whole importation, it would.

6102. That is to say, the great difficulty of distribution to the consumers throughout the country?—There would be so much at one time that it would be impossible to consume it.

6103. If the American dead-meat trade became an established fact in this country, do you not think that it would be possible to regulate the supply so as to meet the demand without there being any great glut?—I do not think so.

6104. You think that it would be impossible?—I do not know about its being impossible. My only reason for not thinking so is this: Mr. Bell was the first shipper: Mr. Eastman followed; and after Mr. Eastman some other gentlemen came into the trade, and we cannot tell them how many would come into the trade if it should prove remunerative; and therefore it is an impossibility for anyone to say that the trade can regulate itself.

Mr. Josiah Burkett, called in; and Examined.

Mr. *Burkett.*

Chairman.

6105. I believe that you are connected with the Central Meat Market?—I am.

6106. Are you a salesman both of American and English dead meat?—I am.

6107. As such, you can speak as to the condition of the American meat on its arrival in London?—As a rule.

6108. Are the consignments to you of American meat very large?—At times they are.

6109. From your experience of those consignments, what have you to tell the Committee in regard to the condition in which the meat arrives here?—The best that I have seen has come by Mr. Link, as a rule.

6110. That was a witness from Liverpool, who has been examined before this Committee?—Yes.

6111. Those consignments have come to the London market in good order?—Yes; and they have fetched a high price; something considerably over the others; I should think, perhaps, 1½ *d.* per lb. more.

6112. Do those cargoes run level in condition, or do you find that, as the last witness stated, some of the cargo comes in in bad condition, and the rest of the same cargo comes in in good condition?—I will take one man's meat first. From January until the first week in May the whole of Mr. Link's consignments were in good condition, and since that time we have had about four shipments arriving in not so good a condition; I heard that the reason was that the hot weather set in in America about 14 days sooner than it was anticipated.

6113. They were not prepared for the change in the weather?—They were not prepared for the change in the weather, and there was not so much care taken as usual.

6114. And you think that the bad state in which those later cargoes arrived was accidental? Yes, and it will be altered shortly.

6115. Has that inferior condition continued up to this present moment?—Yes; we have some in to-day, and that is no better.

6116. So that you cannot say that any improvement has been made?—Not yet; and there has been scarcely time, I should think.

Chairman—continued.

6117. You say that up to a given date the consignments all arrived in good order, and fetched a high price?—Yes.

6118. What was the average price during those months?—The average price was as nearly as possible 6¾ *d.* per pound for the whole time from the 1st of January to the first or second week in May.

6119. Therefore, if that was the average price realised, I suppose, if the statement which has been made to this Committee as to the remunerative price being 6 *d.* or 6½ *d.* per pound is correct, that would represent a remunerative trade?—A very large profit indeed, and that is the reason why we had such immense quantities in March, because they found that it paid so well.

6120. They found that it paid so well that you got a very large supply in that month?—Yes; that was the reason of the additional supply, so I was informed.

6121. The whole supply rose to nearly double at that time, I believe?—Previously to January the meat came in very bad condition, week after week, for about four months. I am taking now September, October, November, and December.

6122. Can you state what the average prices of the meat in that condition were in those four months?—I should say about 5¼ *d.* per pound.

6123. It was under the remunerative price?—The whole of it was done at a loss, I was informed.

6124. You are not speaking of any of those consignments which we have been told realised only 2½ *d.* per pound?—I have had a quantity of that meat, but I am now speaking of one particular sender or consigner.

6125. And that man's consignments, even when they were not so good in quality, never went below an average price of 5 *d.* per pound?—No; because his meat was then the best that came, even although it all came in bad condition.

6126. And

Chairman—continued.

6126. And all that came through Liverpool?—Yes.

6127. And it had stood the journey from Liverpool after it had been removed from the atmospheric conditions in which it had been brought over on board the ship?—Yes. Occasionally it is taken from the chamber on the Saturday, and it remains in Camden Town in the trucks the whole of Sunday; and that is 24 hours extra.

6128. So that it has been for 24 hours outside the chamber before you dealt with it?—Yes.

6129. And even with that amount of exposure to the atmosphere those consignments were in good order during the five months when it realised 6 *d.* per pound?—Yes, it would be about the same; there was very little difference at that time.

6130. When we come to deal with the other cargoes which did not arrive in such good order, I suppose that 24 hours had a material effect upon the condition of the meat?—Yes. I should like to make a few remarks with regard to that consignment. I think about the 14th of last August, I saw a shipment of meat in the best condition that I ever saw any come in. That was during the extremely hot weather, and we were anticipating that it would all come in an excessively bad state.

6131. Was that part of Mr. Link's?—Yes, it was Mr. Link's, and, to our great astonishment, it was the freshest we ever saw.

6132. That was the cargo, which Mr. Link told the Committee was the best that he had ever imported, and this importation took place when the thermometer was at 104 degrees in America, and when it was very hot in this country?—Yes, they had a very large quantity of that. I think, as far as I can say, that it made about 7¼ *d.* or 7½ *d.* per pound.

6133. To your knowledge, was there anything in that cargo which conduced to its coming over in better order than others?—Yes, they had been more careful, and had placed less in the chamber.

6134. It was not packed so closely?—It was not.

6135. At all events, in your opinion, that proves the fact that, with proper care, these consignments may be sent over, even in the hottest weather, in perfectly good condition?—We have decided proofs of it; we have had it so many times.

6136. You have had more than that one instance?—Yes; with the other cargoes we have found it so. Where they have sent, perhaps, 430 or 500 quarters, as a rule, it has come in better condition than where they have sent 2,000 quarters.

6137. It depends very much upon the closeness with which the cargo is packed?—Yes; and it appears that the smaller the chamber the better the condition of the meat.

6138. Therefore, to adopt the system which has been suggested of dividing the chamber into compartments would, in your opinion, conduce even more to the good condition of the meat?—Yes. If you are speaking just now about a cargo of meat containing two qualities as regards condition, I have seen it so several times myself when it comes in the same chamber. In meat which has been taken from one chamber I have frequently seen a difference in value of 1½ *d.* per pound.

6139. Is that sufficiently regular in its occurrence for you to have traced the reason?—We attribute it to the fact that the meat that comes in good condition is nearest the ice.

6140. You mean that the temperature of the chamber in which it comes over is not kept exactly even; that one part of the chamber is colder than the other; is that what you mean?—It is supposed that during the transit of the meat it gets neglected by the engineer, who ought to look after it.

6141. Would not that affect the whole chamber?—No; because the meat that hung nearest the four boxes of ice, as I have had it described to me, would come in the best condition; and the meat that was in the centre of the refrigerator would, perhaps, be in a bad state.

6142. And that, you think, accounts for the varying condition of the cargoes?—Yes; I have seen them vary to the extent of 1½ *d.* per pound, and that is almost 20 per cent.

6143. Is there any other point with regard to Mr. Link's consignments that you would desire to mention to the Committee?—Yes; I have another remark to make. Our best butchers, the leading butchers, purchase it when the condition is good enough.

6144. It has found ready sale amongst the leading butchers of London?—Yes; they buy it daily.

6145. Have they bought it steadily, or do they only buy when your cargoes come over in that good condition?—Within the last month, even to-day, they have purchased it; they have chosen the best to-day.

6146. For sale amongst customers?—Yes, for this day's immediate use.

6147. You corroborate, then, the evidence of a London butcher who stated that he believed that a very large amount of American meat was being sold to the consumers without their being aware of the fact?—That I cannot say; but I know they use it.

6148. Do the butchers generally, throughout the town, use it?—Yes.

6149. And when it comes over in that condition, it has a ready sale amongst the retail butchers in London;—Yes; it has a very ready sale at a good price, and the quality is superior to almost anything.

6150. Do you think that the quality of the American meat is superior to that of other meat that passes through your hands?—There are other meats that are held in preference. There is the Aberdeen beef; those that use Aberdeen beef use the American meat.

6151. The butchers who are in the habit of supplying their customers with Aberdeen meat are not afraid of supplying them with the American meat when it is in good order?—They do so without any hesitation.

6152. Are you prepared to give the Committee information with regard to any other consignments?—I have occasionally seen Mr. Gillett's meat come in good condition.

6153. Mr. Gillett consigns to you also?—Yes.

6154. Is that a steady consignment, or an occasional cargo?—About two shipments a week, and sometimes three.

Mr. *Burkett.*

20 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

6155. To you?—No, not to me entirely; to be distributed over the market more or less. It comes to the London market.

6156. Does that of which you have had experience yourself come over in good condition?—Some of it I have seen in excellent condition. Last week he had some that came in excellent condition.

6157. Last week, during that hot weather?—Yes; it was suitable for any shop, or any trade in London.

6158. And in the hottest weather which we have had during the last few days, it had undergone the process of travelling?—Yes, about 14 hours or 16 hours' exposure.

6159. And still it was sold in the market in good order?—In good order.

6160. Have you tested at all, in either case, the time that it would keep?—It depends upon the period of the year.

6161. Take the cool weather first; how long would it keep then?—From January until April, which is about the coldest part of the year, it would keep from a fortnight to three weeks.

6162. You mean that, after landing and being taken out of the refrigerator, it would keep for that length of time?—Not if it is cut; it will keep in portions weighing 40 or 50 lbs.

6163. After you have dealt with it for sale in the trade, it would keep for a fortnight?—Sometimes it would keep a month in the cold, sharp easterly winds; in fact, I do not think that it would spoil in that time. It keeps longer than English meat.

6164. Having been so prepared in America as to drive out the animal heat first, it is able to resist the atmospheric influence afterwards?—It is. It chills the whole of the fat, and that preserves the lean.

6165. That is with regard to the months from January to April; have you considered its keeping properties when we come to hot weather, say at the present time?—I think it will keep two days after it is sold in our market.

6166. By that you mean two days plus the 14 hours occupied in travelling up to London?—Supposing that we receive a consignment to-day from Liverpool, sent yesterday, I should say that it ought to be sold to-morrow, at the latest, as a rule; but some of it would keep longer than that without being placed in a refrigerator.

6167. If the butchers' shops throughout the country were prepared as they are in America for the purpose of keeping meat, do you think that you might keep it even longer than that?—Most of the shops have refrigerators now; I know of numbers of shops that have large places, rooms, in fact, built up as refrigerators now.

6168. Having those refrigerators, do you still say that it would not keep more than two days?—It would keep a week with ease.

6169. If the butcher had such a chamber in which he could place it until his customers wanted it?—Yes; when the meat is purchased fresh from our market, and when it arrives fresh, it would keep fully a week without any trouble at all, and it might be sold fresh on the seventh day.

6170. And you are satisfied that it might be relied upon by the retail butcher for his trade, even in hot weather?—Yes.

6171. Have you any other consignments made to you from America besides those through Mr. Gillett, and through Mr. Link?—Yes; I have had some from Mr. Samuels, for whom Mr. Pool is the agent.

Chairman—continued.

6172. Have you found those to arrive in good order?—No; in a very bad state.

6173. Then you agree with what Mr. Pool stated, that it did not arrive in good condition?—It was in a very bad state.

6174. Do you attribute that to the process by which it had been prepared?—Yes; to negligence through the whole process, I should think.

6175. To negligence on the part of the consignors?—Yes; the fault would lie in the manner in which it was sent.

6176. And from the experience which you have had of the trade which is carried on through the other consignors, you believe that that need not have occurred?—I do.

6177. Can you speak as to the way in which this meat is distributed to the consumers; do the retail butchers buy for their weekly supplies from you?—Some of the butchers do not slaughter at all, and they come into the market and buy the whole of their meat daily, early in the morning; they make their purchases of certain parts that they require, and it is taken home and delivered to their customers. They come daily in weather like this, and buy just about as much as they think they will require.

6178. Do you now refer to Mr. Tallerman's store?—No, I am now speaking of the wholesale market.

6179. The butchers buy wholesale for their retail trade, under the conditions that you state, of the possibility of keeping the meat for a considerable time?—They do. We will suppose that to-day the market is over-stocked, and they see an opportunity of saving by making a purchase. If they have the necessary conveniences to hold that meat over until they want it, when they know very well that perhaps three or four days hence things will rise in value, they buy and hold it over; otherwise they would not venture to buy it.

6180. And you find that that is practised by the trade?—Yes.

6181. It has been represented to us that the retail traders are immensely dependent upon the purchase of live animals, because of the difficulty of the small man dealing with his trade in the hot weather, and the consequent necessity of his having the animals to kill in the morning; but do you find that the retail butchers avail themselves of this dead meat now for the purpose of supplying their customers in the hot weather?—Yes, and it increases every year.

6182. And that shows that the necessity of having live animals to slaughter is not so great as it was?—No, there is nothing near the quantity of meat killed in London, in proportion to the population, that there formerly was. Our dead-meat markets are more used now than ever; we can prove that by the annual market returns.

6183. The last witness stated that his impression was that the dead-meat trade had not largely increased; you do not agree with him there?—I can prove differently, because I very often hear of the returns for the day. I know that in Christmas week, which was an exceptional week for quantities and for weight, there were about

Chairman—continued.

about 100 tons more meat sent in than in the year previous. I put a question to the inspector to know what the previous years were like, and he said, "It has increased every year that the market has been opened."

6184. The market inspector told you that the dead-meat supply in the Christmas week had increased every year since the market had been opened?—Yes, but last December it had exceeded all previous years.

6185. Can you give the Committee any idea as to whether the general dead-meat trade has increased since the establishment of the Smithfield Market?—It has increased.

6186. Has it been a steady increase; can you show it by any figures?—Not by figures, but I know it from being there daily.

6187. And, consequently, the retail butcher does not rely so much upon the live animals as he did, but comes more to the Smithfield Dead Meat Market?—Yes, and I think that they are gradually giving up buying live stock; they find that the trouble is very great, and likewise it is more expensive.

6188. And they can come into the market and buy the joints that they particularly want for their customers, which is preferable to having the whole animal, and so creating waste?—Yes, and having a surplus which they cannot sell. They leave those portions with us, and we find ready customers for them.

6189. So that we may gather from your experience, that the dead-meat trade has developed largely within the last few years?—That is positively known.

6190. It is gradually taking the place of the live cattle, the need for which for the retail trade was supposed to exist some few years back?—It is; numbers of the butchers who have slaughter-houses never use them now, and they have not used them for years; I know that as a fact.

6191. You state, of your own knowledge, that a number of butchers have given up slaughtering at home altogether?—Yes; I am well acquainted with this district for a mile and a half round, and there are dozens, scores I may say, of slaughter-houses that have not been used for years.

6192. The butchers, having given up the practice of slaughtering at home, since the increase of the dead-meat trade?—Yes; since this market has been opened, there has been a very great change. There was a time when they could not depend upon a supply in the market; if a man did not buy his meat alive, he could not depend upon having what he required daily.

6193. That change has been assisted very much, I suppose, by the American supply?—I should not think that it has; we always had plenty of meat if the price was sufficient.

6194. Was that dead meat supplied then from the home trade?—In the summer time it would be principally from the live market. A large wholesale buyer would buy, perhaps, 100 beasts, and have so many killed a day, perhaps, to supply the butchers.

6195. Can you speak as to Tallerman's stores?—Yes.

6196. Will you describe them?—When the weather was very cold the trade ran very large; I never saw such a trade in my life, in fact. I never saw in a retail trade anything to equal the amount that was sold.

Chairman—continued.

6197. Where are those stores?—Under the Cannon Street Railway Station.

6198. Do they deal principally in the American meat?—Principally; nearly the whole of it is American.

6199. Have the prices there ruled regularly, or have they varied very much?—The prices to the public were fixed for three months certain.

6200. Have the consignments come over in such a condition as to justify that?—When it was not in good condition they used to have English meat, and sometimes Scotch meat.

6201. The price being guaranteed, it had to be supplied?—Yes.

6202. If the American meat came over in good order that was the market for it?—Just so.

6203. Have you any acquaintance with the Aberdeen trade too?—Yes, I trade largely in that meat.

6204. Can you speak as to whether that dead-meat trade has increased?—Yes, it has increased very largely these last seven years; it has more than doubled.

6205. What sort of quantities of dead meat come in from Aberdeen?—Sometimes 120 tons, 80 tons, 70 tons, 60 tons, 50 tons. We should call 30 tons a very short supply. A supply of 30 tons per day would increase the value, perhaps, 2 *d.* per pound. If we had 120 tons of a morning it would give us a large supply, and it would, perhaps, diminish the value about ¾ *d.* or ½ *d.* per pound.

6206. There is a large dead-meat supply from Aberdeen direct?—Yes, from over the border.

6207. Can you give the Committee any information as to how this meat arrives; does it come by railroad?—By rail and boat. It comes from Aberdeen by boat.

6208. Does it come in any way under the same conditions for keeping as the American meat does?—No, it is thrown altogether; it is laid one on the top of the other, just as you would pack other goods.

6209. What time does it take in arriving after it has been slaughtered?—Meat packed this morning would arrive in London on Friday.

6210. It takes two days to come?—Yes.

6211. And for those two days after it has been killed it is merely packed as closely as possible?—It is sewn in canvas, and put in the vans, and sent to London.

6212. Do you find that it arrives in good condition?—Yes, almost always.

6213. During the hot weather as well as during the cold weather?—Yes; we may perhaps have it come in a bad state three times during the summer, and sometimes twice, but not more. It is dry, and clean, and fresh.

6214. And therefore you have from Aberdeen a very steady supply of sound dead meat already on which we can rely?—Yes.

6215. Has your attention been directed to the possibility of bringing over dead meat from the Continent?—It has from Vienna.

6216. Have you had any consignments of it?—None, I believe, has as yet been sent.

6217. But your attention has been called to it?—Yes.

6218. Have you any reason to believe that there will be any great difficulty in carrying on such

Mr. *Burkett.*

20 June 1877.

Mr. *Burkett.*

20 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

such a trade?—I do not see the slightest difficulty.

6219. You have not had any consignments of foreign meat of any kind beyond the American meat?—Yes, lots.

6220. From what parts?—From Denmark and from Tonning.

6221. Could you tell the Committee whether those are large consignments?—From Tonning I have had, perhaps, 60 or 70 quarters in a day, or 40, or 100, or 20, or 10, as the case may be.

6222. That would show that a dead-meat trade has already been established with those countries?—Every year we have it from Denmark.

6223. Is there any difficulty in bringing over meat from there?—Yes, I have known instances. We have found a difficulty, perhaps, in August. They commence it rather too soon; I have known it to commence in the second week in August, and that is too soon; and sometimes it has come in bad condition, and has had to be sold under half its value.

6224. But there is no preparation of it?—Not the slightest. It is just put in a sack, and sewn up, and thrown on the deck of the ship, and there it is laid.

6225. And, notwithstanding that, the trade is possible, in your opinion, even under those conditions, excepting during the hot weather?—They can send it without a refrigerator from September until the season finishes, which is about December.

6226. So that there would be no great obstacle in that case in the way of sending the meat over from that country as dead meat?—I do not see any, more especially if they would take more care. I think if the trade increased so as to be worthy of being recognised as a large trade they would pay more attention to it.

6227. Does the meat which comes over in this way as dead meat realise a good profit on the market?—Not since the American meat has come in, because the quality is so much inferior to that of the American meat that it takes quite a second or third rate place; so that I think last autumn they must all have lost considerably by sending it.

6228. Does that apply to Schleswig cattle?—My opinion is, that if we have meat from Germany, and various parts of the Continent, the quality is not equal to the American meat, so that the American meat is sure to take the first place; and it will so reduce the price of the other that they will not be able to send it.

6229. You believe that although the trade is quite possible from those countries, and although a dead-meat trade does exist, to a certain extent, yet the quality of their meat would not make it remunerative for them to send it?—I do not think that it would.

6230. The American meat would undersell it?—Yes, and it would be in better condition. The trade, as a rule, choose that which pleases the best.

6231. How does that apply to the live animals coming from that country; will not the trade prefer the better quality of dead meat even to buying the live animal?—No; persons who eat American meat would not, as a rule, eat it if they saw it raw before they ate it, because it does not look so well as the town-killed meat. It is well known that for the whole of the Government contracts they will not accept American meat, and yet it is the best meat.

Chairman—continued.

6232. They will not take dead meat at all, will they?—Yes, they will take dead meat, but they will not take American dead meat, and yet it is very superior to anything that we have in Europe except the Scotch beef. It is a well-known fact that the workhouses will not receive an ounce if they know it.

6233. You attribute that to a certain amount of prejudice?—It is prejudice.

6234. Notwithstanding that, you say that the American meat, in your opinion, does form a very large part of the consumption?—That I cannot say.

6235. You are not prepared to say that it does; but it is sold to the butchers at the West End, who probably find customers for it?—Yes.

6236. You attribute the failure which have occurred, as I understand you, to the want of knowledge with regard to the preparation process, and those failures, you think, need not continue?—They must end, I should think, because the losses are so great, and the prices are so moderate, that they must remedy it in some form.

6237. Do you believe that the trade will be a continuous trade as soon as they have found out those defects, and rectified them?—I am certain that one man will send it, and that is Mr. Eastman, who has increased his supply now. He used to send 1,000 quarters a week, and now he sends 4,000 and 5,000, because he gets the best price; his meat comes in the best condition, and, in fact, I believe ultimately he will have his own ships.

6238. What line of ships does he send by?—I really have never asked the question.

6239. Have you ever had any consignments from Mr. Hamilton?—No, I have had one from Mr. Toffey.

6240. I thought that you might have been able to confirm Mr. Hamilton's statement as to the condition in which his consignments arrive in London; in his evidence the other day, he stated that he had received it at Glasgow, and had forwarded it for sale in London?—I saw some in our maket on Saturday. They could not use it in Glasgow, and they sent us about 400 quarters in splendid condition.

6241. You saw meat in the market here in very good order which came from Glasgow, having stood the journey from Glasgow after having been taken out of the refrigerator?—Yes.

6242. Do you know whether it was Canadian or American meat?—American; it was Mr. Eastman's meat, but to whom it was consigned I do not know; we knew it by the mark.

6243. Did it fetch a fair price?—No, it did not fetch a fair price.

6244. To what was that attributable?—The market was so full of meat of all kinds.

6245. The market was glutted?—Yes, it was.

6246. I suppose, under the conditions which you have described, as to the possibility of keeping this meat in properly prepared places for a considerable time, the trade would very soon regulate itself, and that gluts such as have been foreshadowed, in consequence of the introduction of the American meat, would not occur?—If there was not so much live meat there would be no glut. Supposing that the live trade was not so great,

as

Chairman—continued.

as a matter of course, it would increase our trade.

6247. Supposing that the live trade was not so great, the difficulty which has been suggested to this Committee is that you would get the meat on to the market all at the same time, and you would have a glut at one moment, and at another time you would have a scarcity; but that under conditions such as you have described, might, I suppose, be regulated by the trade by meat being kept over for the next market?—Yes; I do not know that a butcher has ever come into the market and gone out without being satisfied with his purchases.

6248. There has always been a supply?—Yes, always. It may have been at a very extreme rate, but I do not know of a case where a butcher has been at our market, and has not been satisfied even in the hottest weather. The supply as a rule is very good. I am not saying now that he could buy just what he wanted. If he said, "I want Scotch," or "I want Norfolk," or "I want West Country," but he could get beef or mutton of some description.

6249. And you do not think that there would be the danger which has been described of the market getting glutted by the supply of meat coming in, and being forced to be sold at once?—No.

6250. From your experience, then, you tell the Committee that the dead-meat trade has increased and is increasing, and that therefore we are not so dependent upon the import of live cattle as we were?—We are dependent upon the live trade.

6251. In what way?—If you took away the foreign meat entirely, I do not know what we should do.

6252. We have been talking entirely about dead meat, and it seemed almost that it was to become a supply which would do away with the foreign import?—We should have no mutton at all.

6253. That is with regard to foreign sheep?—Yes.

6254. Does that apply to the foreign cattle?—No, I think that we could do without the cattle entirely. I remember the first month that the German beasts were stopped I saw no alteration at all. It only affected one or two people, and contractors that went in for cheap stuff, low-priced, common meat. Good meat was no dearer, and was not affected in the slightest.

6255. In fact the prices have not been affected as has been stated by one of the witnesses, by the restrictions that have been placed on the Continental import?—Yes, they have been affected in this way: low-priced common meat, what we call contractors' meat, has been much dearer.

6256. Is there a great demand for that low-priced meat?—It is used for all contracts; for institutions; for the Army and Navy, and such like.

6257. They deal entirely in the foreign import?—It is German meat; it is sound good meat, but it is meat that does not do for most people.

6258. It is in the market at a price at which a contractor takes it in preference to any other?—Yes.

6259. And he will not at present take the dead meat instead?—They will not receive anything that is killed in the country; that is prohibited, I believe; whereas the meat might be supplied in a much better manner if they would accept the American meat; but they will have town-killed meat up to a certain weight.

Chairman—continued.

6260. Those are conditions which they impose to prevent their getting a really cheaper and better article?—Yes.

Mr. *Chaplin.*

6261. I think you told us that the imperfect cargoes that have arrived since the 1st of May would be very shortly improved?—I could vouch for one firm that will do so.

6262. What is your reason for thinking so; have you had communications from the other side?—Yes, I have.

6263. And they assure you that it will shortly arrive in good condition?—Yes.

6264. You told us that up to the present time cargoes have varied very considerably as regards condition?—Yes.

6265. When they vary, I gather from you that that is owing to want of care in the process of preparation on the other side, or to want of attention during their transit, or to some accident to the machinery?—Exactly.

6266. To no other cause?—No.

6267. You have given us some very interesting information as to the time that the American dead meat will keep after its arrival both in hot and cold weather; can you tell us how long English meat, killed in the ordinary manner, will keep in comparison with American meat in the summer months?—The American meat will keep the longest after it arrives.

6268. How will it keep in comparison with the Aberdeen meat of which you have been speaking?—That will keep longer than meat which is killed in London.

6269. But in comparison with the American meat?—It will keep longer than the American meat.

6270. Then I understand you to say that the American meat keeps longer than the English meat, and that the Aberdeen meat keeps longer than the American meat?—Yes, as a rule, the Aberdeen meat will keep longer than anything I know.

6271. What is the average price of English beef as compared with the American meat?—If you speak of the best American meat and of the best English meat, I should think that there is 1¼ *d.* per lb. difference; the American meat is the cheaper by 1¼ *d.* per lb. on an average.

6272. As compared with the Aberdeen beef, what is the difference in price?—The American beef is nearly 2 *d.* per lb. cheaper than the Aberdeen beef, and that varies at different periods of the year. I am speaking now of the present time.

6273. Supposing that the live trade was stopped altogether, do you think that the effect of that would or would not be to increase the price of beef to the general consumer in England?—It would increase the price if you stopped the supply of live cattle; if you make the beef dear or the mutton dear, that sends the price up; and so it runs right through.

6274. But I am speaking of stopping the importation of live cattle and not of live sheep; what, in your opinion, would be the effect upon the price that the general consumer would have to pay for beef if the import of live cattle from

Mr. *Burkett.*

20 June 1877.

Mr. *Chaplin*—continued.

the Continent were stopped altogether?—I do not know what would be the consequence, but it would be something serious now.

6275. Assuming, of course, that the American trade in dead meat continues or increases, and that we have dead meat from the Continent, what would be the result?—It would be cheaper.

6276. The effect of stopping the import of live cattle, provided you had dead meat from the Continent and dead meat from America, would be generally to reduce the price of meat?—Yes, it would all be cheaper, mutton, and everything else.

Mr. *Arthur Peel.*

6277. You stated, I think, that the average price of American dead meat had been 6¾ *d.* per lb.?—Since January this year.

6278. Do you know what the average price of American dead meat was last year?—No, my memory will not serve me as to that.

6279. Mr. Link stated that the average price was 6 *d.* per lb. for the carcase?—That confirms my remark; 6¾ *d.* and 5¼ *d.* is 1 *s.*; and if you divide that the average will be 6 *d.*

6280. Therefore the price has been maintained?—Yes.

6281. When you state that that was the average price, I suppose the prices range over a greater extent?—I have known it to make 8 *d.* per lb., and the lowest price that I have known it to make was 2½ *d.* per lb.

6282. Under what circumstances did it make 2½ *d.* per lb.; was it on account of a glut in the market?—No, it was on account of its being in very bad condition. We had some yesterday that made that price, from 2½ *d.* to 3 *d.* per lb.

6283. You sell it wholesale, but you sell it in small quantities, do you not?—Just as it is required.

6284. Do you mean to say that 6¾ *d.* per lb. is the average price that you get from the butcher?—No, I should think not so much as that. If you are speaking of American meat in general, I should think that the average price during this last 12 months would be from about 5 *d.* to 5¼ *d.* per lb., taking the bad cargoes with the good ones.

6285. The butcher buys it from you at that price?—Yes.

6286. Do you think it is possible that what Mr. Link, with whom you are connected, says is true, viz., that that meat is consumed by the better class of people in London, and not by the poor?—Not to take it generally. When it comes in good condition, then it is used for the best parts of London, because it is equal to anything that they can get; in fact, there is nothing to equal it in London now.

6287. Mr. Link stated, I think, that it was bought as the best Aberdeen meat; can you speak as to that at all?—I cannot.

6288. You do not know what becomes of it when it gets into the retail market?—No.

6289. You stated, did you not, that the Government contractors and workhouses altogether rejected American meat?—I know they do.

6290. Are you sure that you do not mean Australian meat?—No, I mean American meat.

6291. Are you in any way connected with the Australian trade?—Yes.

Mr. *Arthur Peel*—continued.

6292. Have you not imported Australian meat largely?—Yes.

6293. Was not a great objection made to the appearance of the Australian meat?—Yes; it was sold for Australian meat, but it was not Australian meat.

6294. Are you aware that the workhouses reject Australian meat, because the paupers would not touch it?—Yes; but I do not believe that it was Australian meat.

6295. What was it?—It was South American meat.

6296. You think that they have the same objection to American meat?—I should think it must follow that such is the case.

6297. Then the appearance of the United States' meat is so bad, that if you saw it you would not touch it?—There is such a striking contrast between the appearance of American meat, and that of town-killed meat, that I have no doubt that gentlemen when they saw it would not fancy it.

6298. Then what becomes of all that we have heard of the beautiful bloom on the meat?—It would very soon dry, and lose that in the course of six or eight hours.

6299. Would it become so nauseous to look at that people would not like it?—I do not say that, but you would know in your own mind what English meat looks like, and if you saw any change of colour you would certainly object to that; I am speaking from experience; but most of the people who have this American meat at the West End do not see their meat until it is dressed.

6300. You think that if they did see it they would not buy it?—I do not think they would.

Colonel *Kingscote.*

6301. You said, did you not, that the Aberdeen meat would keep better than the American meat, and that the American meat would keep better than the English meat?—Yes.

6302. What is your reason for saying that?—I can give you a satisfactory reason, I think. The Scotch beasts, as a rule, are not driven very far, and they are cool and not at all heated; that is the principal cause of the meat keeping well.

6303. That confirms what Mr. Gillett, I think said, that the meat which was killed in America was, to a certain extent, prepared for death and cooled; but you have told us that the Aberdeen meat comes packed one carcase upon another?—Yes, six or seven deep.

6304. Do you think that that is as good a way of carrying it as hanging it up?—I should think not.

6305. If that meat was brought from Scotland in railway trucks, and hung up, with plenty of ventilation around it, do you think that it would keep much better even than it does now?—Much better.

6306. But of course it would be more expensive to bring?—It would be more expensive to bring.

6307. Would the extra freight exclude it from the market?—It is quite dear enough now; I believe it is about 4 *l.* per ton.

6308. Before the American meat came over in large quantities, was the Aberdeen trade increasing or decreasing?—I cannot remember.

6309. It is now fast decreasing, is it not?—You may say that the season has finished; it has its

Colonel *Kingscote*—continued.

its season. Speaking of the 12 months it has increased.

9310. How has it increased in the face of the price of American meat, which you say is very nearly as good as the Aberdeen meat?—In the first place they cannot consume it if they keep it; the population is not great enough in the northern parts of Scotland. I can give you no better proof of it than by saying that I can remember the time when there were about eight or ten Scotch meat-salesmen, and now, I suppose, there are upwards of 50.

6311. So far as you can judge at present, the increase in the dead-meat trade from America will not affect the Aberdeen trade?—Only to bring it down in price.

6312. But not in quantity?—Not in quantity. What it may eventually do in the course of two or three years, I do not know, because they must sell the beasts that they have now, but whether they will then turn their attention to other farming operations is a matter that I cannot go into.

6313. You say that the butchers are increasing, by using dead meat and doing away with slaughter-houses?—That is so in London, no matter which district you take.

6314. Why is that?—They find that it is less expensive.

6315. I thought the butchers made a good deal of profit by what is called the fifth quarter?—Yes, but that is charged for before.

6316. I think you said that you were agent for Tallerman's?—No, I have supplied him with meat for that place for about three or four weeks.

6317. Do you know whether he is going to establish another West End depôt?—I believe that he is not going to do so now, but I hear that there is a very large establishment to be opened in about six months time.

6318. I think you said that sometimes, owing to their having entered into a contract to supply meat at a certain price, they have been obliged to buy Aberdeen meat?—Yes.

6319. They must have done that at a heavy loss, I suppose?—Decidedly.

Mr. *Anderson.*

6320. With regard to contracts, do you speak from personal knowledge when you say that the American imported meat will not do for those contracts?—No, I said that it would do, but that they would not receive it.

6321. Neither the War Office nor the Admiralty?—No.

6322. Do you know whether it has been tried?—I do not know. I have not been present.

6323. You believe that to be nothing but prejudice on the part of those offices?—I know the quality of the meat.

6324. And you know that it comes to this country in such a state that it will still do for curing?—Yes.

6325. Will they neither receive it for consumption fresh, nor for curing purposes?—They will not receive it at all; it is prejudice; they will not even investigate the matter.

6326. They have never tried it, in fact?—No. They have had a quantity, you know, but they do not know it.

Mr. *Anderson*—continued.

6327. Then they are receiving it without being aware of it?—Yes, but not in any great quantity. If it comes in in very nice condition it is too dear for contractors' purposes.

6328. Does that apply also to workhouses, hospitals, and institutions?—Yes, they all refuse it without trying it, really, if they know it is American beef.

Mr. *French.*

6329. I understood you to say that you were entering into an arrangement for carrying on a dead meat trade with Vienna?—Yes.

6330. When is that trade likely to commence?—I do not think that it will come to anything, because I believe that the parties who are interested will not risk the cargoes themselves, and they wish the parties who are to receive it here to be answerable for the condition, and as it is an experiment, it would, perhaps, create a loss.

6331. If people could be got to agree with each other, you think that all the requirements, such as ice and everything of that kind, could be got easily enough there?—I should think so.

6332. There is no difficulty then in the way except that of individuals making arrangements amongst themselves?—Not the slightest, because for nine months in the year we have the meat from Hamburg without any preparation at all; it is merely laid upon the ship's deck.

6333. Do you think that in case of the importation of live cattle from the Continent being stopped, the import of the American meat is likely to be increased so as to make up the deficiency in the supply?—Certainly it is. If the prices advanced here the supplies would increase tenfold, no doubt.

6334. The prices would lower again when the market came to right itself?—Certainly.

Mr. *Chamberlain.*

6335. You say that the dead meat trade in the central market has increased; and I think the Chairman asked you whether it was not taking the place of the live cattle trade; do you think it is?—No, I do not think so.

6336. You think that, in fact, it is only that the slaughtering is now done wholesale instead of separately by the different butchers?—It is now done wholesale.

6337. And probably there are still as many live cattle in stock for slaughtering as ever there were?—I should think so; more than would take twelve months.

6338. Do you have any consignments of dead meat from Ireland?—Yes, I have had pork.

6339. But not dead-meat cattle?—No, I do not think that I ever saw any.

6340. Do you say that the consignment of beef from Scotland is increasing?—Yes, every year.

6341. In comparison with the live trade?—Yes, I should think they all run together as regards the increase.

6342. Why do you think that the dead meat is sent; is it cheaper to send dead meat than live cattle?—They save the loss in weight which they would have if it were sent alive.

6343. Do they get as much for the offal in Scotland as they would in England?—No, but they make more of the meat, because meat killed in Scotland eats much better than meat killed in

Mr. *Burkett.*

20 June 1877.

Mr. *Chamberlain*—continued.

London. It makes the highest price of anything that we have; it far exceeds anything. If it is a short supply, it will run, perhaps, 1½ *d.* per pound beyond anything we have in the market.

6344. If it is to their advantage to send dead meat, I want to know why the live cattle trade does not, in fact, altogether cease?—The number of live cattle that came from Scotland is not very great. Even in the season, 500 on a Monday is considered a quantity.

6345. Do you think that the proportion of dead meat from Scotland in comparison with live meat has increased within the last ten years?—I should think that there is more dead meat. As I have already stated, I remember the time when there were only 10 or 12 Scotch salesmen, and now there are 40 or 50.

6346. I suppose the live cattle trade has also increased during that time?—I cannot answer for that.

6347. Do you know whether the proportion of dead meat to live meat has increased during that time?—I do not know.

6348. Do you know why more dead meat does not come from Ireland?—I should think in the first place the quality is not good enough.

6349. Will you explain that?—It would meet with a very poor sale.

6350. Do the live cattle meet with a very poor sale?—No, they would meet with a better sale.

6351. I do not quite understand you?—The Irish meat as a rule, is very thin, and it is meat that does not eat well; and the consequence is that it would take, as regards price, about a third or fourth place.

6352. But if the cattle is poor, that would affect the price of the live cattle as much as the price of dead meat, and I do not see that it would affect the proportion when you have to consider whether you would send it dead or alive?—I have no doubt that it has been tried in the winter time, but I do not remember it. If the quality was good enough, and it paid, they would be sure to send it, because it is no great distance.

6353. You say that some dead meat comes from Denmark?—Only for about eight or ten weeks.

6354. Do you know whether that meat is killed voluntarily for the dead-meat trade, or whether they are only weak and inferior beasts?—They are inferior beasts that are slaughtered.

6355. Are they slaughtered only because they cannot bear the journey alive?—I should think that they are very old cows, as a rule; rough common meat.

6356. Then it is not really a fair experiment?—It is as regards the condition they come in.

6357. But the condition you told us was very bad?—For the first portion of the season. They generally send it about the second week in August and finish up about the third week in November.

6358. Is it good during any part of that time?—Sometimes, if the weather is good here.

6359. But during the time that they do send it is generally bad?—Yes, in the first part of September; that is a very bad month, but I have known it come sweet even in that month.

6360. You say that you think you could do without live cattle entirely; but I understand you to say that, if it were now suddenly prohibited, it would involve a very heavy increase in price?—Yes; I wish to explain myself thoroughly there. If you stopped the foreign cattle from coming, and if they did not kill their meat and send it dead, the meat would go to an enormous price; to something like 20 per cent., I should think. We are very much dependent upon them at the present time.

6361. I think the honourable Member for Lincolnshire asked you, however, whether, if dead meat were substituted for live cattle, it would make any difference, and you said it would not; but do you think that such a substitution is likely to take place?—I do not understand the question.

6362. Of course, if a corresponding amount of dead meat were substituted for the live cattle prohibited, there would be no difference in the price?—It would be cheaper, because directly it arrives here it must be sold within a day or so.

6363. But do you think that such a substitution would take place?—It would for a short season, but I think, as the last witness said, that ultimately they would not send at all.

6364. Therefore you think that ultimately the result of prohibiting live cattle would be to increase the price of meat in England about 20 per cent.?—Then we should have to depend upon other sources for our meat; upon America, perhaps, unless it got much dearer there.

6365. You would expect that the export of dead meat from America would in that case increase?—I should judge so, because the price would increase the consignments, and it would pay better.

6366. But it would drop off again the moment the price fell, and it would only increase if the price increased?—Certainly.

6367. And, therefore, it still follows that there would be an increase of price, although, perhaps, not 20 per cent?—I should think meat would be very dear if they stopped the foreign supply. They must send something for a season, because they cannot consume what meat they have; but after they have sold their stock, I think they would turn their attention to some other pursuit.

6368. You could not in any case do without the importation of live sheep?—I think it would be impossible.

6369. Why do you think it would be impossible; why should not mutton be imported dead as well as beef?—They do not stand the test so well.

6370. Do you mean that the mutton arrives in worse condition than the beef?—Yes, it is not thick enough to stand the operation. I think that mutton might be brought from the Continent fresh enough, but it is a failure from America, unless they have some other process. It is only about four days, or at the most five days from the Continent, and they could bring it fresh enough if proper care was taken.

6371. If it were proved that you could not keep out disease without prohibiting the importation of live sheep as well as of live cattle, you would say that you would not prohibit either?—No, I should think not.

6372. As I understand, up to the present time, there have been very great variations in the quality of the dead meat coming in from America?—Not in the quality so much as in the condition.

6373. You

Mr. *Chamberlain*—continued.

6373. You think that that might be overcome?—It will, no doubt.

6374. But it has not been overcome yet with 18 months' experience?—No; but the best proof is, that each man will have a fresh consignment of meat occasionally that we are all astonished to see.

6375. I understood you to say that some of the last consignments that you received were some of the worst?—Yes, they vary. There are about seven or eight men sending now from America. At times each man has a fresh consignment of meat, but one man in particular as a rule has it fresh, and that is Mr. Link.

6376. But even Mr. Link has it sometimes bad?—Yes, he had some to-day not very good.

6377. Do you know anything about the quantity of American meat consigned to this country?—I have not the slightest idea.

6378. Do you know that it has been very much less in this month than in the preceding months?—I should judge that it was so; they are not consuming so much in the provinces, I believe.

6379. I understand that in June you consider that the consignments are very much smaller?—Yes, I know from experience that they are.

6380. And you know that it is not being taken in the provinces now?—Yes, not so much.

6381. Why is that?—The public do not like meat when it is not fresh; they prefer paying an extra price, and having what they like, fresh killed meat; it does not look well; as soon as the weather changes, the meat changes in colour, and the public set their minds against it.

6382. And you think that we in the provinces do see the meat before we eat it?—Yes.

Mr. *Elliot.*

6383. Did I correctly understand you to say that it takes four or five days to bring dead meat from the Continent?—From some parts five days, and from some parts two or three days.

6384. How long does it take to bring live animals from the Continent?—I suppose from Vienna it would take from four and a half to five days.

6385. How long does it take from Hamburg?—About two days.

6386. Then it is about the same distance as from Aberdeen to London?—Yes; I should think it is about the same distance.

6387. Have you had any dead meat which has come from the Continent in very hot weather?—Yes, I have had meat from Denmark in August.

6388. Is it not very much affected by heat?—I have been surprised at its being fresh, but it has been sound.

6389. Has it been as good as the American meat, as far as condition is concerned?—Yes, it has been as good as the American meat, as far as condition is concerned.

6390. Then, in your opinion, it is not necessary, so far as the continental trade is concerned, to have any refrigerating process, such as the American meat requires?—Not in the winter time.

6391. But you say that the meat comes in the hot weather fresh, and therefore it would not be necessary to have any refrigeration during the summer?—Yes; but if you carry meat upon the deck, single, in small quantities, the cold air there would preserve that meat; but if you pack it 10 or 20 in a case, one upon another, you would not be able to get much air through it.

Mr. *Elliot*—continued.

6392. It has been alleged that the want of ice is one of the difficulties in bringing meat from the Continent; it would not require so much ice in proportion, would it, as it does from America?—It must go through the same process in the summer time.

6393. Do you think that the offal could be brought with the rest of the meat?—Yes.

6394. Could it be brought perfectly fresh to the English market?—Yes, we have had the offal from America, so we take it for granted that it could be; I have had quantities of it. When you speak of offal, I am speaking now of hearts and tongues.

6395. The eatable part?—Yes.

6396. That meat has been perfectly fresh?—Yes.

6397. Has it sold at a price that the poor could buy it at?—Yes, they have purchased it.

Mr. *King Harman.*

6398. You say that, in towns, a great many of the butchers have a sort of storehouse, which is to a certain extent refrigerated?—Yes, most of the butchers have.

6399. Do you believe that in case the American trade should assume very large proportions there would be any difficulty in having storehouses of large size in which a sufficient quantity of meat could be kept to prevent the market being glutted?—That would have no effect upon meat that is in a bad condition beforehand; but with regard to meat in good condition, certainly it would.

6400. Supposing that large store-houses of that kind were established at Liverpool, so that there would not be any great length of time between the time that the ship's store was opened and the time that the meat could be placed in a store on land, do you think that under those circumstances the meat could be kept for a sufficient length of time to enable the market to be regulated?—Certainly it could.

6401. And you anticipate that something of that kind would be done?—No doubt it will be done at both ends, both in London and at Liverpool. It frequently happens that they will not allow a ship to remain any longer, and they are obliged to clear the ship and send the meat up to London.

6402. Do you know anything at all about the Irish fat cattle trade; the honourable Member for Birmingham was asking you why the Irish dead meat did not come more into the English market?—A quantity of sheep and pigs come, but nothing else.

6403. Do you know as a matter of fact that the fat cattle in Ireland come to the butcher chiefly in Dublin?—I was not aware of it.

Mr. *Jacob Bright.*

6404. Have you long been connected with the meat trade?—For about 28 years.

6405. During that period of 28 years, has not the tendency been for meat constantly to rise in price?—No, it was dearer in 1846, and it was excessively dear in 1854, 1855, and 1856, during the Russian War.

6406. That was from special circumstances?—Yes. Then it was dear in 1861 again at the time when we had the rot in the sheep.

Mr. *Burkett.*

20 June 1877.

Mr. *Jacob Bright*—continued.

6407. But apart from those special circumstances, the tendency has been for it to advance?—Yes, it is much dearer.

6408. Are there not great complaints on the part of the consumers throughout the country, that meat is dear and scarce?—Yes, I believe that there are.

6409. Do you regard meat as a necessary of life?—I think it is a necessary of life.

6410. Do you not think that it is a good thing to have all necessaries of life as abundant as possible?—Yes, I do.

6411. And to have them as cheap as possible?—Yes, I do.

6412. If you increase the quantity of an article, does it not tend to diminish the price?—Always.

6413. And if you diminish the quantity, does it not tend to increase the price?—Immediately.

6414. I do not understand how, with these views of yours, you could say so positively, as you have said to this Committee, that we could now do without foreign cattle?—I will explain that; perhaps I did not explain it enough in your hearing; I meant that, as regards the foreign cattle, if we do away with them alive we must have them dead; they must come; we cannot do without them I am positive.

6415. We could do without live foreign cattle if we had them dead; but do you fancy that a great dead-meat trade could be readily organised, so that as it were by an Act of Parliament you could get rid of the import of live cattle?—I believe that in the course of six weeks from to-day we could have enough meat from America to supply all we wanted and do away with all the Continental meat entirely.

6416. That is your opinion?—Yes; you asked me my opinion.

6417. But you would not, on a mere prophecy, begin to deal capriciously with the food of the people?—I would not. I believe that it would be a very serious thing to stop the cattle coming from the Continent.

6418. Did you not tell us that the exportation of dead meat from certain portions of the Continent had ceased to be profitable, owing to the American meat being so superior?—It really is not required only to come to some minor place, scarcely worth anything, you may say.

6419. It is cut out, in fact, by the American meat being superior?—Entirely.

6420. In that case, if we are to get the meat from those portions of the Continent, it must come alive or not at all?—I should think so.

6421. If that be so, surely you could not adhere to your statement that we could now do without live cattle from the Continent?—I have explained to you just now that what I meant was, that if we stopped the live cattle coming we must have the same quantity of beef come dead. It does not matter whether it comes from America or from there.

6422. But you have admitted that it will not come dead from those parts of the Continent, because of its quality?—I should judge not. They might try it, but it would not last, because it would make so much less per pound.

6423. You admit, of course, that to cut off supply anywhere is to enhance price?—Yes, immediately.

6424. Putting the case of sugar, or wool, or cotton, or any other article, if you said, "Oh, we have a great supply in this country, we need not care for that supply." You would, by diminishing the supply, increase the price, would you not?—No doubt.

6425. You admit that there are probably millions of persons in this country who get very little animal food?—Yes, I should think so.

6426. And who would get it if it were 5 per cent. cheaper?—I think that there are hundreds of thousands who have had it cheap enough in these last two years in London, who have never had it before.

6427. Is it the consumer who has had it so cheap, or the butcher?—The consumer.

6428. That is to say, when the butcher gives 3 *d.* per pound for his meat, he sells it very low?—Yes.

6429. Speaking generally of the country, is it not so?—No, it is only in London. I think that the poor of London have had a great boon in the price of meat.

6430. Seeing that meat is constantly advancing to a very stiff price, do you not think that there would be intense jealousy on the part of the people of the country if you cut off any of their supplies?—Not if the price was not enhanced.

6431. Have you had American meat in the market regularly the whole of this year, every day?—No; sometimes we have been three or four days without any.

6432. When that is the case, you still have to supply your customers, I suppose?—Yes.

6433. In that case you buy English meat?—Yes.

6434. What is the lowest price you have ever given for English meat when you have had to buy it, when you have been short of American meat?—Sevenpence per pound when there has been no American meat.

6435. When you have been short of American meat you have never supplied yourself with meat at less than 7 *d.* per lb.?—I should think not.

6336. Is there not a common kind of English meat that does sell at less than 7 *d.* per lb.?—Not English; German, or Danish or Dutch.

6437. But not English?—Not as a rule. You are speaking of oxen, I presume?

6438. I am speaking of beef and mutton?—That is a very wide question. There are about seven or eight qualities.

6439. But you are not accustomed to buy those lower qualities?—No; but we have all manner of qualities in our market. If you speak of oxen, there is nothing lower than that.

Mr. *James Corry.*

6440. Have you seen any of the American live stock that have been imported into this country?—Yes.

6441. How do they come?—They are very good indeed. Very fine beasts, larger than ours, as a rule.

6442. Are they killed immediately on landing?—Oh, no; they are kept sometimes a week, according to the convenience of the purchaser.

6443. I have heard that a considerable number were landed at Southampton, and I know as a matter of fact, that a great many are coming from Canada to Glasgow regularly every week. Do you think that that trade might be increased during

Mr. *James Corry*—continued.

during the summer months?—I do not know the expenses that are attached to it. I am told that the expenses are too great for them to be sent alive.

6444. Are you aware whether the navy is supplied with American salt meat?—I am not aware of it.

Mr. *Torr.*

6445. You began by giving us a description of Mr. Link's imports chiefly; do you know his import better than that of any other consignee?—No; I know the others because I see all the consignments that come in.

6446. Were you present when Mr. Link gave his evidence?—I was never here before to-day.

6447. Probably you are aware of the purport of his evidence?—I am not.

6448. He gave an assurance to this Committee that the import of American beef would continue to increase to a very large extent; has he ever made communications of a similar purport to to you?—Yes, I have heard that; I know that six months ago that was their intention

6449. You are aware that for five months we have had no import of German cattle owing to cattle plague?—Just so.

6450. Do you not think that the suspension of the German supply had some influence upon the American dead-meat supply?—Yes; I think that it had.

6451. You stated in direct terms: "I think we could do without the German live cattle altogether"; was it following out that idea that you had got from Mr. Link, that if it were suspended, you would have not only a large but a rapid increase in the import of American dead meat?—Yes.

6452. Was that the basis of your expression?—Partly. Then I should certainly expect that if they did not send their beasts alive from Germany they would send them dead.

6453. You have no reason to suppose that they would not send them?—They will do so; they have done so for years already.

6454. And consequently you are under no alarm that if that German supply of live cattle were suspended, this country would suffer materially in its supply of beef?—We should certainly have to depend upon America; they could supply all the deficiency.

6455. You are still then of the same opinion as you expressed, that this country would be supplied, and amply supplied, with beef from America and elsewhere, if the import of live cattle from Germany were suspended?—Yes; I think that we should be very short for the first two months, until they were in a position to send.

6456. You are aware that the only object of suspending the import of live cattle from the Continent would be, if possible, to stamp out the diseases from which our home herds suffer?—Yes.

6457. Do you not think that if that could be effected, our home supply of beef would be very materially increased?—I feel confident that it would. I think that it would give a spirit to the farmers to breed and fatten.

6458. If a moderate per-centage of increase of our home supply, which, of course, is vastly larger than all our imports of foreign meat put together, could be effected, it would eventually

Mr. *Torr*—continued.

make beef cheaper in this country, would it not?—Certainly it would; and we should have a better quality for the public.

6459. And at a lower price?—Certainly.

6460. I understood you to say just now, that the Germans have now, for some years already, sent over meat dead?—Yes.

6461. Are you able to speak of it as having been consigned to you?—No; but I have seen it come past my place.

6462. Have you seen it in any quantities?—I have known 2,000 quarters in a week at the most, and the least, perhaps, was 50 quarters from Hamburg. It has been for years in existence.

6463. And that would lead you to think that such a trade could exist if the live import were stopped?—That is the point. They send generally from the commencement of November up to the first week in June.

6464. You said that we were very much dependent upon the foreign live stock at the present time, and that prices would go up 20 per cent. if it were limited; has there been any perceptible rise in prices in consequence of the diminution of the foreign import from the restrictions preventing the cattle from coming here?—Yes; the common meat has risen, I should think, $\frac{3}{4}$ *d.* per pound.

6465. But I understood you to say that the supply to London had not risen in price?—Good meat has been no dearer.

6466. The consumer who depends upon the lower class of meat has suffered?—Yes; the consumer who depends upon the lower class of meat has suffered materially.

6467. And it was that which you meant to say when you said that the price would go up considerably if the import of foreign live stock was stopped?—As soon as the common meat becomes dear, it raises the price of the best meat.

6468. What was the price of the common meat?—It varies; there are many prices; some of it is 6 *d.* per pound, some 5 *d.*, some 5½ *d.*, and some 6½ *d.*

6469. Has the American trade not taken the place of that?—No; simply because they cannot use it for the same purposes; they will not have it. This common meat is used for contracting purposes, as a rule.

6470. But setting aside the contractor, has the general public suffered, seeing that the American meat has stepped in at a time when we have been restricted in our foreign importations?—I should think not in London.

6471. You say that the consumers generally, setting aside the contractors, have not suffered by this diminution of foreign supply, because the American meat has come in and filled the gap?—The general public have not suffered.

6472. And then you say that the people who are supplied by the contractors have suffered, because the supply of the class of meat which the contractors take and on which they depend, has been diminished?—Yes.

6473. If you got over the prejudice which made the contractors limit their purchases to this foreign supply and enabled them to buy in the dead-meat market, which is as cheap as the foreign supply, would those poor people whom I understand you to say the contractors supply, have been prejudiced at all any more than the

Mr. *Burkett.*

20 June 1877.

Mr. *Burkett.*

20 June 1877.

Mr. *Torr*—continued.

general consumer?—It certainly would have an effect.

6474. You have allowed that although the foreign import has been stopped, or practically so for a time, the general consumer has not suffered; but you say that the people who are supplied by contractors have suffered?—No, I do not say that they have suffered; the contractors have suffered.

6475. Then who is the person who you say has suffered a loss in consequence of the foreign importation being stopped?—It is the contractor who would lose in that case, not having the goods according to his contract.

6476. Supposing that you got his prejudice as to the American meat, and opened the trade, the contractor would not lose if he could buy American meat, would he?—Not if he could use

Mr. *Torr*—continued.

American meat, and if they once get over the prejudice.

6477. When the question of prejudice is done with, there is no reason to say that the consumer will suffer at all by the restrictions that have been placed upon the import of foreign stock, because that diminution of stock has been met by the dead-meat supply?—Certainly.

6478. And that is a state of things which has been going on now for nearly five months, and the prices have not risen in that time?—No; not to the general public.

6479. Has your attention been called at all to any efforts that have been made in Schleswig with a view to preparing a dead-meat market, in consequence of the Order in Council which has just been issued obliging them to come to the Deptford Market?—No.

Friday, 22nd June 1877.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Major Allen.
Mr. Anderson.
Mr. Assheton.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Cameron of Lochiel.
Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. Chaplin.
Mr. Dease.
Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.
Mr. Elliot.
Mr. W. E. Forster.
Mr. French.
Mr. John Holms.
Sir George Jenkinson.
Mr. King Harman.
Colonel Kingscote.
Mr. Murphy.
Sir Rainald Knightley.
Mr. Arthur Peel.
Mr. Ritchie.
Sir Henry Selwin Ibbetson.

SIR HENRY SELWIN IBBETSON, BART., IN THE CHAIR

Mr. JOHN GIBLETT, called in; and Examined.

Mr. *Giblett.*
22 June 1877.

Chairman.

6480. YOU are a Cattle Salesman, I believe, in the London market?—I have been engaged in that trade for nearly 50 years; I never have any cattle of my own; I am exclusively a salesman.

6481. As such, I believe you have dealt largely in cattle imported into England?—Yes; more so than most people.

6482. Your attention has naturally been directed to this inquiry, and to the questions that have been raised before this Committee as to the continued import of cattle from foreign countries?—Yes.

6483. The consignments to you are very largely from Spain, Portugal, and America, are they not?—From Oporto, from America, and from France; the consignments from France used to be very large.

6484. That importation from France, at all events, of course is now stopped; but was it a large importation during the last two years?—Within the last year our firm sold 2,000 beasts from France.

6485. That is during 1876, before the prohibition issued?—Yes; and in the year before we had very large quantities of fine cattle, particularly at Christmas time.

Colonel *Kingscote.*

6486. Were they all live cattle?—Exclusively live cattle, with the exception of the American meat which happens to be sent to us, which we distribute to other people.

Chairman.

6487. Confining ourselves to the import of live cattle, first of all, have the consignments to you of French cattle fallen off within this last few years?—Very much.

6488. To what do you attribute that?—To their being obliged to go to Deptford.

6489. Have they been for very long obliged to go to Deptford?—Yes; for the last two or three years.

Chairman—continued.

6490. French cattle have been treated as cattle from a scheduled country, and slaughtered at the port of debarkation?—Yes.

6491. And you would represent to the Committee that that fact has diminished the exports from France?—Very largely.

6492. Can you give the Committee any figures from your own experience, showing what the export from France to this country was before and after the cattle had to be slaughtered at Deptford?—About ten years ago myself and my son, that is to say, our firm, sold 9,998 French beasts in one year, and they averaged 27*l.* each; that is within two of 10,000 oxen from France alone.

6493. That was prior to the restrictions with regard to slaughter at Deptford?—Yes.

6494. Can you give the number subsequently to those restrictions being imposed?—After trying it two or three times, the large dealers determined not to send any; but, however, they altered that determination, and within the last year we have sold 2,000.

6495. I understand you to say that though on the first starting of the Deptford Market the French trade almost ceased, it has subsequently come back again to this country, to a certain extent?—To a small extent.

6496. And you say that you sold about 2,000 last year, as compared with 9,998 ten years ago?—Yes.

6497. Then the fear of the Deptford Market has not entirely crushed the trade there?—Not entirely, but very much so.

6498. Have the consignments to you from Spain or from Oporto been as large as your French consignments?—I estimate that we had through the year about 30,000 cattle coming into England.

6499. That is, from Oporto?—From Oporto and Spain. Many of those are very large and good

Mr. *Giblett.*

22 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

good oxen, and the smaller of them are very generally used, and are almost necessary for the Army and Navy.

6500. You mean that contractors buy the Spanish and Portuguese import very largely?—Yes, and they have proved to be more sound than beasts from any other country; England, Ireland, or Scotland.

6501. You state that, from your own personal knowledge, from their passing through your hands, and from the way that they are bought?—The proof is in the practice. There are no persons so particular as to the healthfulness of the meat they kill as the Jews. Of those cattle that come to London (and in our firm we have sometimes 10,000 or 12,000 a year), the Jews buy more than half. Why? Because they are more sound than any other beasts; the lungs are more clear; the lights do not adhere to the sides of the beast; there is no pleurisy.

6502. We have had evidence that the German and other foreign exports, which have been referred to before this Committee, are of animals which sell at a cheaper rate than the English animals; can you tell the Committee what is the price per pound in the market of Spanish and Portuguese animals?—Very generally they make nearly as much as the very best English beasts, and if you will allow me I will explain the reason why. The offals are worth so much more money, and the hides are worth more than twice as much just now as those of the English oxen. Last week I saw the hides of some of those animals sold at 3 *l.* each, and that is a good deal more than the hides of English oxen fetch, and therefore they make so much more per pound, or, as we term it, 5 *s.* 8 *d.* to 6 *s.* per stone alive.

6503. That would range with the price of the home supply?—Entirely.

6504. And it differs in that respect from the other foreign supply as to which we have had evidence?—Yes, in consequence of the offals being worth more; and the quality of the meat of some of those Oporto beasts is as good as that of any beasts in the world; I mean, of course, the youngest and best.

6505. With regard to the Spanish and Portuguese exports, we have not suffered in this country from disease imported from those countries, I believe, but they have been declared to be free of disease generally?—Generally, but they have been subject to foot-and-mouth complaint, and in their case we have deemed that they have been very cruelly, and, as has been admitted, most unfairly treated, as compared with the way in which many other countries are treated.

6506. You mean that the restrictions which exist with regard to the slaughter of the cargoes on one animal being detected suffering from foot-and-mouth disease have operated very severely as against the Spanish and Portuguese export?—They continue to send a large number of animals.

6507. But you say that those are the restrictions which you think have acted severely upon the trade?—Yes, they have acted very severely, but still they have not annihilated the trade.

6508. You would represent to the Committee, from your own knowledge, that the restrictions that exist as to foot-and-mouth disease with regard to foreign animals, press very severely upon this Oporto trade?—Yes. Several cargoes that have been sent to us have been stopped, because one or two animals have proved to be affected; and in some cases they were thought to be affected where it was afterwards proved that they were not.

6509. Are those the points which you present as hardships, because when they were proved to be affected that would apply equally to the whole foreign imports?—Just so; but there has been hardship and injustice in that particular case as I describe. You will excuse my speaking emphatically; my object was to give a most distinct and explicit answer.

6510. We have dealt with the French and the Oporto animals; with regard to other imports, have you imported live beasts from America?—I have had them consigned to us from America.

6511. Were they consigned to you at Southampton?—Yes, lately. I could give you an account of every ox by reference to these documents that I have in my hand. I keep having them every week in large quantities.

6512. Is that import into Southampton from America an increasing trade?—Yes, the practice of sending them to Southampton is increasing.

6513. In what sort of condition do the animals arrive from that country?—Almost all that we have had, and we have had many hundreds lately, come in very good and sound condition. On an average, not more than two or three are injured in a cargo of 180.

6514. Is that an average taken over the whole year or only over the five summer months?—It is not found to answer to risk sending large quantities of animals alive except during the fine weather.

6515. You believe that the trade would not be a continuous trade throughout the year, but that it would be a trade limited to the time when the passage was tolerably calm?—That is their intention, I know.

6516. Those animals have come over, you say, generally in very good order; do they fetch a remunerative price as compared with the other animals that you have spoken of?—They make considerably more per head. I think that the 2,800 that I have had from America within the last year have averaged from 29 *l.* to 30 *l.* each. Yesterday I sold 90 American oxen in the market; they came from Southampton, and they fetched 29 *l.* each, all but 20 *l.* on the lot; and we have the remainder, 170, which will realise in all probability 32 *l.* or 33 *l.* each; they are most excellent meat.

6517. Have you had consigned to you any of the dead meat from America, so that you are able to compare the two?—Yes, during the last three months I have had about 2,000 quarters of beef altogether, and I have the account here of the very price that each made. I can give you exactly what they make alive, and what they make dead, and not, as some witnesses do, their opinions as to what they might or would make.

6518. I suppose you can state with regard to one consignment that which would show us pretty nearly the general history?—Yes. By the "Greece," on the 20th of June, there were 568 quarters which have been sold, with the exception of a few, at the price of 3 *s.* 5¼ *d.* per stone, which would be about 5 *d.* and a fraction per lb., not quite 5¼ *d.* per lb.

Some

Chairman—continued.

Some of the oxen which came by the same boat I sold yesterday at 5 *s.* 8*d.* to 6 *s.* per stone, which would leave those carcases of beef to stand the butcher in 5 *s.* 4 *d.* per stone, which is 8 *d.* per lb.; so that, in fact, although the weather has not been so very hot yet, we conclusively prove that in this case that the beef makes 3 *d.* per lb. more alive than dead.

6519. Do you mean that the live animal with its offal stands at that price to the butcher?—No, it makes from 5 *s.* 8 *d.* to 6 *s.* per stone alive, and by valuing the offal at what it is worth, that would leave the carcase at 8 *d.* per lb.

6520. The offal is, of course, a separate item as it does not come over with the dead meat?—Yes. It leaves the carcase at 8 *d.* per lb. But we have had many other cargoes. I have here the particulars according to the sale from the different wholesale butchers to whom we send them, because we do not sell this dead meat personally ourselves. On the 1st of June we had 550 quarters, and the price of the meat was 4½ per lb.

6521. Was that the price at which it was sold as an average for the whole quantity?—Yes. I have an account here of 20 odd oxen which came by the same boat, and which were bought by Mr. Cope, and sent into the dead meat market; and the average price that the carcases of live oxen made was 5 *s.* 2 *d.* per stone, that is 7¾ *d.* per lb. Then we had another case where the meat was sent at 6*d.* per lb. to a certain person whose name I presume I need not mention, and we had to receive the money on account of the sender. The price was 6 *d.* per lb., and we did receive the money, and I am told that it did not realise half the price. We received 6 *d.* per lb., and I am told on good authority that it did not make 3 *d.* per lb.

6522. Are you able to speak from your own personal knowledge of the condition in which the cargoes of dead meat which you have had consigned to you came over?—I am, for I am generally in the dead-meat market three times a week on an average, because we go there with a view of learning the real state of the trade, so that we may estimate the value of our live oxen.

6523. From your own observation, could you state whether that meat which was consigned to you at 6 *d.* per lb., and which you say realised not more than half, came over in bad condition?—I know it came over in exceedingly bad condition; that was the cause of its making so little.

6524. You say that it came over injured in condition from transit?—Yes; but I have seen a great deal of other meat which has not been consigned to me, and a great deal comes over in the winter in good condition, and it is a very great benefit to the poor. If I may be allowed to say so, I am a strong advocate for having all the meat you can, both dead and alive.

6525. You have stated that this dead meat comes over at a price of about 5 *d.* and a fraction per lb.?—This week it does.

6526. Therefore that would be in good condition, I presume?—No, not at all in good condition; but it fetched that price because our trade is good.

6527. Have those consignments of dead meat from America been steady consignments to you, showing that the people were remunerated by

Chairman—continued.

the price which they received?—Lately there has been a little falling off; but if it had continued, I should have had reason to know why it did continue, inasmuch as I know that arrangements were made with the boats to bring certain cargoes whether they answered or whether they did not.

6528. You mean that they have a contract for a given time, which obliges them to send meat over, even though the remuneration is not sufficient?—I know that that is the case in some instances.

6529. You are not able, of course, to speak as to the way in which the meat which was sent over had been prepared in America; whether it was prepared for the voyage in the way that has been described to this Committee, or whether it was an experiment made to test the efficacy of one particular process?—No, those were sent over by the regular boats, by the large steamers, with the usual cold chambers; I have the names of the boats.

6530. Were they sent over direct to London?—They were sent over in the ice cells. The last three lots have been sent to Southampton.

6531. And, therefore, they were subject, before they came on to the London market, to the ordinary atmospheric influence after having been taken out of the chamber?—Yes; but we had a singular case the day before yesterday. We had 580 quarters of this dead meat consigned to us, and Mr. Kilby, in the market, had 500 quarters consigned to him; he not wishing that his meat should clash with ours, or that ours should clash with his, arranged that his should come on in the cold chambers into the river here; we determined to land ours at Southampton. Ours was delayed one day, and the persons to whom we sent the meat considered that that one day's delay had deteriorated the meat, and made a difference in the price to the extent of from 6¾ *d.* to 7 *d.* per stone. That is the testimony of two of the men that I have seen this morning, unto whom we consigned the meat. It was landed upon the Tuesday night at Southampton, and it should have been in the market upon the Wednesday morning; but in consequence of having some 3,000 cheeses packed upon this meat, they could not get it out at Southampton in time to get it up into the London market on Wednesday, and, therefore, it suffered very much from that one day's delay.

6532. It was held over for the Thursday's market?—Yes; it was held over for the Thursday's market.

6533. That would represent two days outside the chamber in which it came over in the ship?—Nearly; but in the other case it was far worse, for I have seen Mr. Kilby this morning, and his meat that came over from Southampton in the cold chamber remains unsold now, and he says he shall not make 5 *d.* per pound of it.

6534. That was brought over in the cool chamber, as I understand. Was the reason of its not being sold the fact of its being depreciated in value, or the fact of its coming on the market at a time when there was too great a supply?—I should think the latter is one cause.

6535. It can hardly be put down entirely to the fact that the meat is depreciated, and therefore they cannot sell it?—That which came to us, and which was part of the same cargo, was in far better condition than that which I saw this

 morning,

Mr. *Giblett.*

22 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

morning, which came up in the cool chambers round by the river.

6536. Are you able to speak at all as to the statement which has been made as to the consumers taking this meat freely; do they like it as well as other meat?—I believe that the majority, after having tried it, have a distaste for it altogether, and they find a distaste in it; that is my conclusion.

6537. But you do not speak from personal experience on that?—I tried it once.

6538. At the same time we have had evidence, and I suppose you are not prepared to dispute that evidence, that it is circulated largely in the trade in London, and that people make no complaints of it?—Its appearance is very much against it. It is not calculated to be sold among the poor, because it looks so much worse than it really is. The Army and Navy will not have it, as I heard the other day; and I know as a fact that the contractors are not allowed to send it to the poorhouses or to the prisons.

6539. The contractors have a regulation that they do not buy anything but live animals, have they not?—I beg your pardon, they have dead meat; but even at the places where they are allowed to send dead meat, they will not receive this American meat because it is so disfigured; it looks so bad.

6540. I understood a witness the other day to say to this Committee that the contractors generally did not buy dead meat, and that they absolutely refused to buy it; that is not your experience?—I know that in many cases they have exclusively dead meat, but in other cases their aim is to get their supply alive if they can. The Government contracts for Aldershot are taken now by my especial friends, Messrs. Hope and Harrington.

6541. If it is the case that there is not an absolute restriction with regard to their purchasing dead meat, and if, as you say, contractors do buy dead meat, I suppose, if the dead meat came over from America in the good condition that many of these cargoes are described to have come in, there would be nothing to prevent their buying meat in that market?—If it came in good condition, and the appearance of it was good, they might; but it is the fact that they do reject it. A contractor told me yesterday that he had sent some, and that he had had it returned.

6542. It might be that in that case the contractor had a prejudice against the dead meat, and preferred the live animal?—It would have been policy on his part to send it, because he could get it for so much less.

6543. Have you any facts in your possession which would lead you to think that this American supply will continue?—Yes, I do believe that it will continue to be sent in large quantities in cold weather, dead; but in the hot weather it cannot be sent without fearful loss.

6544. That is your opinion?—It is founded on fact, inasmuch as I have a letter here from the largest sender in America, which shows that the loss on the dead meat is 560 *l.*

6545. Is that from New York?—Yes.

6546. Is it from Mr. Eastman?—No; Mr. Samuels. He says that the price is rising so much that oxen are worth 3 *l.* a head more in America than they were a few months since.

6547. Does that letter state that the prices in New York have risen, or that the prices have risen in the districts where those cattle are purchased?—He says that his relative is now in Canada purchasing, and that the Canadian oxen have risen 3 *l.* per head.

6548. But he does not tell you that the American supply, which was spoken of the other day as coming from Chicago, has risen in price?—Yes, he is one of the largest buyers there.

6549. Will you be kind enough to read the letter?—Yes, if you will allow me to leave out a name; it is only the name of a person to whom he sent a quantity of meat, and who refused to take it. This is a copy of the letter; it is dated the 9th of June 1877, and it is as follows: "We enclose an account of 160 oxen and 568 quarters of beef shipped by steamer "Greece" on the 6th instant. We beg to acknowledge your kind favour," and so forth, "and we were much pleased to hear from you; we have not fully determined what steps to take in the matter" (the gentleman I referred to) "having refused to receive the consignments which were brought here for him." Then he goes on to say; "Cattle are selling here higher every day; to-day they are selling at least from 2 *l.* to 3 *l.* higher than our first shipment this season, and if your markets do not improve it will be impossible to continue our shipments without losing money." This letter is sent from Mr. Samuels to Messrs. Bell, of Glasgow, who are the persons who consign everything to me in London.

6550. Those consignments that you have spoken of are the consignments which Mr. Hamilton, the flesher, from Glasgow, I think, spoke of as being sent forward by Messrs. Bell to London?—Yes; they are all consigned to us. The letter goes on: "We have just received your cable of the result of the 'Carinthia' shipments, and they will barely bring cost. The same cattle could not be bought to-day for less than 3 *l.* a head more. Our Mr. Levi Samuels is now in Canada to buy cattle, but we are afraid that the sales in the 'Carinthia' will have a very discouraging effect upon him. With regard to our London shipments, we are fearful the expense will eat up the profit. The beef shipped in Canada has lost us 2,600 *l.*, and in regard to the cattle by the same steamer, we have not been informed as yet whether they arrived safe, although the cash is remitted for the same. We will endeavour to ship our cattle to London by way of Thames Haven hereafter, instead of Southampton, and our next London shipment will be made in the steamer 'Holland,' sailing from here on the 20th instant. Please keep us fully posted in regard to the state of your markets, and cable the arrival of every steamer and the condition of the shipments."

6551. That letter evidently refers, then, to the cargoes that have been consigned to you from Glasgow?—No; this refers to those that were sold in Glasgow, both the live and dead meat.

6552. But I understood you just now to say that you had from Mr. Bell dead meat that had been sent to him consigned to you in London?—Yes; large quantities.

6553. I understood you to say that it was not of that that you were speaking when you were describing the condition of the meat, but of some meat that you had had from Southampton?—Yes; that was what I was describing to you before, that which came into our hands. But this

Chairman—continued.

this is a letter to Mr. Bell speaking of sales which he, Mr. Bell, made in Glasgow.

6554. As you have stated that with regard to the condition of the cattle that arrived from Southampton, can you, as we have had some evidence about the consignments of dead meat from Mr. Bell to London, which, I suppose, from what you now state, were consignments to you, tell us whether these consignments arrived in good order or not?—The first for which we took the money, viz., 6 *d.* per pound, made 3 *d.* per pound; I never had any except through Mr. Bell this year.

6555. Does that letter refer to the quarters of meat that you spoke of as having been sold on the 20th?—No; this only refers to that which was sold by Mr. Bell in Glasgow.

6556. You state that to the Committee to show that you do not believe that this trade at its present price will be a continuous trade, but that the prices will go up?—I believe that in winter it will be a continuous trade, but not in summer, for dead meat.

6557. Notwithstanding what has been given in evidence before this Committee, that in the hottest weather in summer some of the best cargoes have been imported?—They must have been those that I have not seen.

6558. I suppose on that fact you would state to the Committee that you believe that it would not be wise to kill all the cattle from the Continent, to prohibit the import of live animals, and to set up a dead-meat trade with the Continent generally?—The very proposition appears to me so unreasonable that I am only astounded that anybody could ever have made it.

6559. The proposition, of course, is founded on the idea that, for the purpose of eradicating cattle disease in this country, you would be justified in taking all precautions to prevent its introduction, and that one of the greatest precautions would be the stoppage of the live-meat trade from countries where you cannot have the same power as you have in your own country of establishing and enforcing regulations?—The idea must be purely theoretical, because it could not have been founded upon practice. In fact from some countries it would be monstrous to suppose that it is capable of being sent, as for instance, from Spain and Oporto, and from Oporto more particularly. Such oxen as I have described, which I sell sometimes 50, 60, or 80 in a cargo at 29 *l.* each, are fed in a very rich manner upon a particularly rich kind of food; they are chiefly fed upon Indian corn or maize; they are fed at certain times of the year upon the leaves that grow like lily leaves, which are very rich; there is a great deal of saccharine juice in them. It would be absolutely impossible for that meat to be killed in a hot country like Spain and sent here without fearful loss.

6560. You believe that a dead-meat trade with Spain would be impossible from the difficulty of establishing slaughter-houses and places in that country?—No; I believe it would annihilate trade, not from the difficulty of establishing slaughter-houses, because they could create any number of slaughter-houses, but from the impracticability of killing that rich meat there and sending it over here dead.

6561. You think that the system which is adopted in America, by which, on slaughtering the animal, he is at once subjected to a cooling process which drives all the animal heat out of him, and puts him in what they state to be a condition to bear travelling, could not be applied to the cattle in Spain and Portugal?—No. In extremely cold weather there might be an exception, but in any weather that was not extremely cold it would not be practicable, because the very process which they pursue of dipping these oxen into tanks immediately after they are killed must, it seems to me, be very deleterious to the meat.

Chairman—continued.

6562. That is not the question I wish to refer to. The process which has been described here is that on the slaughtering of the animal, the quarters of the carcase were at once subjected to a cooling process in a chamber, prepared very much in the same way as the refrigerating chamber in which the meat is carried over, in which the temperature was gradually reduced until the animal heat was driven out of the carcase, and that, when so prepared and so chilled through, the quarters were placed in the refrigerator which brought them to this country, there being no dipping at all carried out in that system. If that is possible in America, with a temperature of 104 degrees in the shade, as was described, would it not be possible to carry out something of the same kind with regard to the trade of which you are speaking?—They have had such serious losses in sending meat from that country with all their experience, that I do not think it would be wise to suppose it practicable to adopt the process in countries where the heat is greater and the beasts richer.

6563. You think that the losses that would be sustained would stop the trade, and that we should lose that supply?—I firmly believe it.

6564. And that supply is one which comes from a country from which we import very little disease, if any?—They are the soundest beasts I know, and the finest formed beasts of any in the world.

6565. The animal is a very valuable one, as competing with the animal of this country?—Some of them are as square as oblong boxes.

6566. If your opinion is that we ought not to put a stop to the import of live animals, would you think that it would be necessary to increase our existing restrictions so as to prevent the import of disease from foreign countries, or how would you propose to deal with the question yourself?—As a member of the Smithfield Club for 48 years, I do not think that there is one gentleman in the country who is more anxious than I should be to see every precaution taken to guard against the possibility of cattle plague coming to this country.

6567. Do you refer both to cattle plague and to other complaints, or simply to cattle plague?—I am speaking particularly with regard to cattle plague. As for the other ailments, I know that they have been worse in England before any foreign ox was ever imported.

6568. With regard to cattle plague, you would think it wise to establish such restrictions as might tend to give us permanent security against its importation from abroad?—From countries where cattle plague existed, or had existed for any length of time, I would not allow any ox or any meat to come.

6569. With regard to countries as to which no such fear of cattle plague existed, I suppose you would propose that they should export cattle freely into the country?—It is most essential to

Mr. *Giblett.*

22 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

feed the poor, for there cannot be a greater blessing to the community than having cheap meat. We cannot compete with foreigners until our people are fed cheaply.

6570. That is with regard to cattle plague; but with regard to pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease, do you think that restrictions as to slaughter at the port of cattle from countries where those diseases were proved to exist would be justifiable?—There is hardly any country where foot-and-mouth disease does not exist, and I do not wonder at it, inasmuch as it is generally believed to be purely atmospherical.

6571. I suppose you do not attribute pleuro-pneumonia to the atmosphere?—Yes, I attribute much of the lung complaint to the change of atmosphere, especially in young animals from Ireland.

6572. Do you think that pleuro-pneumonia is not contagious?—I cannot undertake to give an opinion about that.

6573. However, that the existence in a foreign country of pleuro-pneumonia being a disease which is treated as a fatal disease in this country, and which is very injurious when it breaks out, would not in your opinion justify us in slaughtering at the port of debarkation, animals coming from that country?—It exists in almost every country; it exists in Ireland particularly, and in many parts of England, and in the cowsheds of London.

6574. Pleuro-pneumonia, I believe, does not exist in Spain or Portugal?—No, it is never known there.

6575. It is said not to exist in Denmark; and you would make no distinction as between countries, where a disease of that sort, which is very fatal when introduced does not exist, and countries where it is known to exist to a great extent, from which you might by allowing free import into this country be certain of getting increased centres of pleuro-pneumonia?—If you are speaking of the lung complaint exclusively, it is very difficult to draw a hard line against any country because pleuro-pneumonia may exist there, because it exists in all counties that I am conversant with at home.

6576. Whilst we continue to have pleuro-pneumonia generally spread throughout the country, you think that it should not form a reason for a line being drawn against the import from countries where it exists abroad?—No. As to the foot-and-mouth complaint, if I may be allowed to make the observation, my experience proves to me (and I speak of what I know) that it was worse in this country and more general long before an ox was imported into England, than it has ever been since. That I know.

6577. Was that before 1842?—Yes; three or four years before; it was very bad indeed.

6578. You would say that that is not a disease to prevent the introduction of which we should be justified in stopping the import of cattle from abroad?—No; nor according to my view are we justified in continuing the present laws as they are.

6579. You would relax even the present laws with regard to foot-and-mouth disease?—Certainly; and I would certainly make them uniform. I would have them emanate from a central head, the Privy Council, instead of giving liberty to any local authority to be partial in their own case or not.

Chairman—continued.

6580. You agree with other witnesses that the power of issuing regulations and restrictions for all these diseases should centre in the Privy Council, and that the local powers should, for these purposes, be done away with, so as to bring about uniformity?—Yes.

6581. I suppose, from what you have said, that in almost every case you would either prohibit importation from countries where cattle plague existed, or from which the introduction of cattle plague was possible (putting aside pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease), or you would allow the cattle, when sent over to this country, to go freely into the Islington Market, instead of being sent for slaughter to Deptford?—Certainly. It is very easy, I think, to show how they may go from that market through the country without doing any harm. I would not allow any to go out except for killing purposes.

6582. You agree with what Mr. Gebhardt, I think, stated on that subject?—I scarcely know his opinion, but it has long been mine.

6583. He recommended that the Islington Market should be made a slaughter market, and that animals which were once sent in there should only go from it under a license for slaughter, and not for exposure in other markets?—I am glad to hear that that is his opinion; that is my opinion, and I have held it for a long time. I would have every animal marked, the tail shaved, a broad arrow put in a conspicuous place upon the animals with scissors; and I would have a penalty of 3 *l.* for every ox coming from the Islington Market which was afterwards exhibited or exposed for sale in a country market.

6584. Practically that would limit it to taking the animal from Islington away anywhere for slaughter alone?—Yes, and what a boon that would be to many counties which do not create enough animal food for their own supply.

6585. And in that way, I suppose, you would say that you might relax the restrictions which oblige animals to go to Deptford for slaughter?—Certainly I would.

6586. In fact, you would do away with the Deptford Market altogether?—I hate a covered market. I have stood in an open market for 50 years, and I should not stand in the Deptford Market 10 years and keep my health.

6587. Is your dislike founded only on the fact that you have been accustomed to an open market, or on reasons which you could give the Committee against a covered market?—We have fresh air at the Islington Market instead of the awful smells that they have in Deptford, and I should ask to be permitted to express the hope that the Privy Council would send a sanitary inspector there just to see and feel what I have felt upon the subject. I have seen men going about six together, with their handkerchiefs up to their noses, because they could not bear to smell the fearful stench which arises there.

6588. I gather from your evidence that you think we are perfectly justified in this country in taking any precaution that may be necessary against the introduction of cattle plague?—Certainly.

6589. But, with regard to other diseases, from the fact of their prevailing extensively in this country, you do not think that we should be justified in making regulations as against the foreign import, and you believe that we could get over the necessity of slaughtering at the port by

Chairman—continued.

by making Islington Market a market for slaughter alone?—With proper provisions about their going out.

6590. With proper provisions to protect the public against their being taken into other markets?—Yes.

6591. Is there any other point which you wish to mention to the Committee?—From a report which I have seen of Mr. Sheldon's evidence, it appears that he had an idea that an ox in America could be bought for 16 *l.*

6592. I presume that what you wish to give is your personal experience, which you think differs from the evidence that is before the Committee?—Yes; this is a letter from Mr. Samuels, in which he speaks of a beast of the same weight which Mr. Sheldon spoke of, and it costs him at least 23 *l.*

6593. Were those animals bought in the same market as Mr. Sheldon spoke of?—In Canada.

6594. Mr. Sheldon was speaking of the Chicago trade?—It made a difference of 7 *l.* per head.

6595. I understand from your previous evidence that the prices in the Canadian trade have generally risen?—Certainly.

Mr. *W. E. Forster.*

6596. How long have you been in the trade?—I think about 48 years.

6597. Can you recollect what the price of beef per pound was when you began the trade?—The lowest price that I can recollect was a general price of 4½ *d.* per pound; that is 3 *s.* per stone when alive.

6598. And the rise, taking 10 years by 10 years, has been pretty continuous, has it not?—It is three times as much now as I have known it.

6599. I do not mean allowing for temporary fluctuations, but, taking 10 years by 10 years, I suppose the rise has been pretty continuous?—Yes, except in 1851, at the time of the first Exhibition.

6600. With your great experience of the trade, I should like to know what you think the main cause of this rise has been. There are two interpretations of it. Some witnesses think that it has been owing to cattle plague and other diseases; and there are, I believe, persons who think that the chief causes are, first, the increase of population; and, secondly, the greater prosperity of the working classes. Which of those two causes do you think has produced the rise in the price of meat?—I have stated on the paper that I have given to the honourable Chairman that my belief of the causes was, first, the increase of the population; and, next, the restrictions connected with the foot-and-mouth complaint.

6601. Do you not think that not only the increase of population, but also the better position of the working classes, has had a good deal to do with it?—Certainly. When I said the increase of the population I also meant the increase of the work that they have. In Scotland the working population hardly used to eat any meat compared with what they do now.

6602. You must have watched the trade pretty narrowly; do you think that, taking one year with another, not taking any particular moment of depression, the poorer part of the population of London consume much more meat than they did?—I think that a great many of the poor cannot get any.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

6603. That was always the case, I suppose?—It is more the case now, inasmuch as it is now so dear, and then it was cheap.

6604. But do you think that upon the whole the consumption in London has or has not increased more than would be accounted for by the mere increase of population?—Yes, the habit of eating meat, especially amongst strong working men, has increased.

6605. With this increase of price, two or three new supplies have been developed; I suppose the supply of live cattle from Germany has all come in since your early experience?—Yes, I think I had the first.

6606. And from Holland?—Yes.

6607. And from Denmark?—Yes.

6608. And from Spain and Portugal?—Yes, I had the first from Spain and Portugal.

6609. I need scarcely ask you whether the dead-meat supply is not quite recent either from the Continent and from America?—For 10 or 15 or 20 years they have sent dead meat.

6610. But not in large quantities?—They sent mutton first; and then a great deal of beef has been sent from Aberdeen.

6611. But I am talking of America; the importation of dead meat from America in any quantities is a recent affair, is it not?—Entirely so.

6612. Having these facts before us, that the price has largely risen, and that new supplies have developed themselves, what do you think would be the effect upon the price if we stopped one of the supplies by prohibiting the importation of all live cattle from the Continent?—It would make it fabulously dear.

6613. Then you have no belief that the rise in the price would induce the continental exporters to try the experiment of sending dead meat, and so to bring the price down again?—No, I rather believe that the reduction of the price would cause them, instead of rearing cattle for our market, to turn their land to other purposes, or to send their cattle to other countries.

6614. You are aware that several of the witnesses who are interested in the trade, think that the advantages to the consumer of this import of continental cattle are much more than counterbalanced by the import of disease and the consequent diminution of the home cattle; you do not agree with that opinion?—No; neither do I believe the statistics which I have read about the number of cattle.

6615. I understand you to say that you do not believe that the stoppage of the import of live cattle from the Continent would have any perceptible effect upon either pleuro-pneumonia or foot-and-mouth disease in England?—It would certainly not have any material effect as regards the foot-and-mouth complaint; and from some countries it would not augment the lung complaint at all, because they are sound; from other countries, where they are not quite sound, it may have the same effect as their passing from one county of England to another.

6616. Do you sell home cattle?—Yes, I have sold some of the finest Scotch cattle, Mr. McCombie's, and others.

6617. I suppose you do almost as large a business in home cattle as you do in foreign cattle?—All my business was in home cattle at one time.

Mr. *Giblett.*

22 June 1877.

Mr *W. E. Forster*—continued.

6618. At this time do you do a large trade in home cattle?—It is not now nearly so large in home cattle as it was.

6619. But you have had, and still have, sufficient experience of home cattle to be able to compare them with the peninsula cattle?—Yes, certainly.

6620. Would it not appear to you almost an absurd opinion to suppose that there was more disease with the peninsula cattle than with the home cattle?—I feel perfectly sure that there is very much less. I know all about the diseases which have taken place in the home cattle; I know it in Scotland, and I know it in Ireland, and I know it in every county in England.

6621. Then the prohibition of the import of Spanish cattle, in order to stop disease in England, would seem to you absurd?—Childish.

6622. Would you not apply that same remark to Denmark?—Denmark is perfectly sound. It would seem suicidal to our own interests to stop the supply of good meat.

6623. You made a remark that you thought that the present restrictions (I do not mean the restrictions merely in consequence of this little outbreak of cattle plague, but the restrictions which existed six months ago) had a very bad effect upon the trade; what do you exactly mean by that?—I was alluding particularly to the foot-and-mouth disease. I have known many cargoes stopped when they were perfectly sound.

6624. Then you think that the restriction which obliges the whole of the cargo to be slaughtered because one or two of the animals are ill, has a material effect upon the import?—Yes; as to France, I know it has a very material effect upon the quantity that is sent.

6625. And you compare that, in your own mind, with the fact that if a large drove came into the Islington Market from any part of England, and half the animals were affected with foot-and-mouth disease, all the rest would be sold without any restriction whatever?—It has been the case for the last year or two, that whatever number were affected with the foot-and-mouth complaint, all the rest went everywhere else throughout the country

6626. Then it is the fact that, whether it ought to be so or not, the restrictions against the spread of disease are very much heavier upon the foreign cattle than they are at this moment upon the home cattle?—According to my view of the case, they are very unjust. In Ireland they are favoured, and we are not.

6627. You, I suppose, have received consignments at the Deptford Market ever since the Deptford Market was established?—Yes; I have had large consignments from France.

6628. And German cattle also?—Yes; but not so many.

6629. Has not the uncertainty as to whether the cattle should or should not be sold at Deptford been a great inconvenience in the trade?—Wonderfully so. Some days at Deptford I have had a good trade, and afterwards we have not been able to realise nearly the market price.

6630. It is not that uncertainty to which I am alluding; has there not been an uncertainty in the mind of the exporter as to whether or not it would be necessary for his cattle to be sold at Deptford, or whether he would be allowed to go to Islington?—Yes; he does not know whether he can find them there till close upon the time he wants them.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

6631. My reason for asking that question is this; do you not think that, if all the cattle from the Continent, or, at any rate, from Germany and from France, were ordered under all circumstances to go to Deptford, there would be against the immediate disadvantage the advantage that the exporter would know which market his cattle were to go to, and that consequently arrangements would be made for the conduct of the trade with more certainty than is possible at present?—But that would be a mere nothing compared with the immense disadvantage of obliging them to go to what I term and what I feel to be a condemned cell; you will excuse strong language, if you please, inasmuch as I have been there so often and know the evils of the place.

6632. From your practical experience, will you tell the Committee why it is such a loss to the consignor to send to Deptford rather than to Islington?—In the first place there are no retail butchers there; and the retail butchers are like the swordfish to the leviathan of the deep; the retail buyers urge on the wholesale buyers to progress in the same way as the swordfish compels the whale to move on.

6633. Would not the retail buyers be likely to come there if they knew that there would always be a considerable amount of cattle imported into Deptford, whereas at present they do not know whether the cargoes may not come after all to Islington?—Certainly not; a great many of them hate the place, and they will not go at all. I offered one gentleman, Mr. Cockrill, to send a carriage and pair if he would come; that was a man to whom I have sold 50,000 *l.* worth a year for many years past. No, he would not come if you offered him 20 carriages and pairs, and gave them to him into the bargain.

6634. The railway is not yet made to the market, is it?—No, it is about three quarters of a mile off.

6635. There is an immense population about the market, is there not?—Yes, but see how sallow and bad they look; you will see our Islington salesmen look very differently; though, I think, if they were to go to Deptford much they would have an Asiatic appearance.

6636. With regard to the sale of offal, is there as good a market for it at Deptford as in other parts of London?—No.

6637. Why?—They do not get so much; I have been often obliged to have a quantity of oxen killed because of the paucity of buyers; I could not get customers to go down there to buy them, and then there is devolved upon us the most disagreeable duty of selling this offal, and it makes a great deal less than it would in other places.

6638. Turning to the dead-meat trade, I understand you to say that at the present moment, at any rate, the exporter has to run a great risk in that trade as to something happening that would make his cargo unsaleable when he gets it here?—There is every reason to believe that in the summer time it would be a great loss.

6639. Comparing the dead-meat trade with the live-meat trade, would it not be fair to recollect that there is also some risk with regard to the live meat: for instance, is it not true that not unfrequently cargoes from the Continent have been

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

been so delayed by stress of weather that they have suffered very considerably?—Yes.

6640. Therefore there is risk in both, and you would have to charge a sort of insurance against the risk in each case?—But the risk of bringing cattle from Oporto is comparatively nominal, for we have had thousands and thousands brought over with scarcely any casualties at all.

6641. Do you object to telling the Committee what the freight from Oporto to England is?—They used to pay the proprietors of certain boats 2 *l.* per head; and now the importers have boats of their own, and therefore they can afford to bring them at a great deal less. Messrs. Hope and Harrington have the most splendid arrangements for their cattle; they are quite model sheds; they have an inspector over there, at a cost of 300 *l.* or 400 *l.* a year, to take care that all the cattle shall come sound; it is of vital importance to them, they serve the army with so many.

6642. What is generally the length of the voyage from Oporto?—About four days on an average, but sometimes it takes only three and a-half days.

6643. What is the freight of a beast from New York?—I will confine myself to what I know. I have documents here which give the money that I pay. I paid 7 *l.* 10 *s.* each for those which came from New York alive, and about 4 *l.* 10 *s.* for carcases of others.

6644. It sounds strange to me that, having to pay so much as that, there was the slightest chance of profit upon the animal?—I should think that all I have sold from America have made 30 *l.* each, and that is about one-fifth more than the average of English beasts would make; because a great many of the English beasts are sold long before they are fit to be sold; they are prematurely killed. It would be a benefit to the farmers, no doubt, if meat were cheaper. They cannot get stores.

6645. We have had evidence given here by an American gentleman, who is much interested in the dead-meat trade, in which he made this statement: that if the carcase was brought over under fair conditions, that is to say, under the conditions which he thought had been obtained by his process, and in which his cargoes had generally come over, the carcase that was taken out of the refrigerator on board the ship would, even in the hottest weather, last many days longer than the carcase of an English animal killed on the same day that the other was taken out of the refrigerator; what is your opinion with regard to that?—Mine is more than an opinion, because it is founded upon experience. I have proved here, by reference to two highly respectable men, that the American meat becomes deteriorated to the amount of three-farthings per pound by one day's delay.

6646. But do you not think that that could be avoided if the process were properly carried out?—It is one thing for them to talk about carrying it out well, and it is another thing for them to do it.

6647. Have you ever seen a cargo that has come over in which you think that the carcase would last in good condition in hot weather for two or three days after it was taken out of the refrigerator?—No, certainly not; in cold weather I have seen it come in good order.

6648. Have you ever had much consignment

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

of dead meat from Aberdeen?—Not consigned to me, but I know all about its coming in large quanties.

6649. Does that come in the summer?—Very little, indeed, comes in the summer; they have had very large losses when they have attempted to send it in the summer; some does come, but not in large proportions.

Mr. *Wilbraham Egerton.*

6650. Do you know anything about the importation of live cattle from America?—Yes.

6651. Do you think that that importation will increase, especially during the summer months?—Without a doubt it will, from what I hear and from what I see of the quality of the animals.

6652. Do you think it is possible that before long London will be better supplied by dead meat from America during the winter, and by live cattle during the summer, than it is at present from abroad?—I think it would be a very excellent auxiliary.

6653. Why do you say that it will be an auxiliary?—Because it will assist to increase the supply.

6654. But supposing that the Americans were able to send the quantity of meat and of live animals into our market, which they say they can send (and which no doubt they can if they wish to do so; that is to say, provided the price pays them), surely the foreigners will be beaten out of the market?—I do not see that, because I feel sure, especially from the evidence that I have heard, that the price of meat will rise as much there. Just now it is a very bad time; a vast number of the population in America are out of work; but if they had better times, with the competition of sending a large amount here dead and alive, the price must necessarily rise; and, indeed, it has risen, according to this return, 3 *l.* per head in two months.

6655. There is still a margin of profit even if it should rise still more, is there not?—I do not know.

6656. From evidence which we have had before this Committee, it would appear to be so?—I do not know the cost price.

6657. Will you tell us the margin of profit which the foreigner has?—It is very uncertain, indeed. He is speculative; he trades with a hope of getting a profit, and it must vary very much.

6658. What is the lowest remunerative price for cattle from the Continent?—There is no established profit for them.

6659. At what price would it no longer pay the foreigner to send his cattle here?—A great many of them cease to send. They try it on; it depends upon their ability in buying.

6660. Do you know anything about Dutch cattle?—Only from what I see, but I do not sell them.

6661. Does much dead meat come from Holland now?—I think not.

6662. Is there any reason why all the stock from Holland should not come in the shape of dead meat, seeing that it is only a 12 hours' passage?—It is far better that it should come alive, I should think.

6663. Is there any reason why it should not come dead, considering that it is only a 12 hours' passage?—I prefer its coming alive. I used to buy for my friends many hundreds of these

Mr. *Giblett*.

22 June 1877.

Mr. *Wilbraham Egerton*—continued.

Dutch oxen; they are very well adapted for Government contractors for the troops, because they do not want meat too fat.

6664. Have you ever bought Portuguese and Spanish animals for Government contractors?—Yes; I have bought them for other people. They send immense quantities to Aldershot every week; this week a large quantity is going there; there are 200 going to-morrow.

6665. Are they sent dead or alive?—Alive.

6666. I suppose there is no reason why Portuguese or Spanish animals should not continue to be imported alive, those being countries where they have no disease?—I think that it would be perfectly impracticable to attempt to send over in a dead state rich meat of that character, fed so richly as they are, neither is there any necessity for it.

6667. If the Portuguese or Spanish animals were allowed to come in alive, the Government contracts would be still as well supplied as ever?—They want competition; the Government have to give very high prices now.

6668. But the American live animals would afford competition, would they not?—No, they are rather thicker and more massive and better than the Government want. They do not want oxen at 30 *l.* each; they want comparatively lean oxen.

6669. Do the Government never buy home cattle for the supply of the troops?—Some contractors do and some do not.

6670. Therefore that supply would not be cut off?—A great deal of it is cut off naturally inasmuch as we eat them before they are ready. On an average, we do not feed the animals beyond two and a half years old, and a Government contractor can afford to give 20 guineas for animals that graziers ought to buy for feeding at 14 *l.*

6671. Is there not tendency at the present day to kill animals very much younger than they used to be killed?—Yes.

6672. That is good policy, is it not?—It is very bad policy so far as regards the supply of food for the people; because if you kill them at that young age there is no substance or weight in them and you have nothing left. You kill them before they are ready in six cases out of nine. A quantity of store cattle are killed which ought to be kept for the benefit of the graziers and to be made into large fine oxen; they are prematurely killed to supply the want of the country, and if the supply from abroad was cut off they would kill them so rapidly that you would not have half the supply left.

6673. Would not that rather tend to encourage the rearing of more animals in England?—Yes; it is astonishing to me that they do not do it, but the fact is that they do not.

6674. Is it not the fact that the farmer is discouraged from doing so by the introduction of diseases with foreign cattle?—One would imagine that he need not be discouraged because the price is still high. At the Chamber of Commerce (of which I have heard so much, but which I have seldom known to do anything practical), I have proposed that there should be a system of buying up the young calves, and keeping them for a year somehow, and distributing them by yearly sales at the end of the year; I thought that that was a very feasible idea, but it is not yet adopted, and half the country is not stocked. There is a district, for 20 miles round to London, where there is plenty of feed, and where there are hardly any cattle to be seen. England does not produce nearly what it might, and it does not seem to aim at doing so; and if it does not do so, let us have all the good cattle we can get from abroad.

Mr. *Wilbraham Egerton*—continued.

6675. You do not think that the American meat will at all interfere with the production of meat at home?—I think that the large quantity of American meat that has come dead has lowered the price of meat here, and has created a great deal of undue apprehension, according to my view of the case.

6676. Do you know what average price the farmer has got of late years for his animals which have been sold to the butcher?—Yes.

6677. Can you tell us what it has been, as compared with the price which the butcher has charged to the consumer, or with the wholesale price?—Taking the last year, the farmer has realised, on an average, 9 *d.* per pound for his oxen. The butcher may appear to have charged a very high price, but the truth is that everybody wants a sirloin of beef, and everybody wants a leg of mutton; nobody thinks of having shins and legs of beef: even the poor do not want to cook the same joints as our forefathers or mothers before us did. Then there is a horse and cart here and a horse and a cart there, and two miles to go for an order for a mutton chop.

6678. Has the American meat at all diminished the price obtained by the farmer?—Occasionally it has diminished it, but now it is a good price; it has been 9 *d.* per pound or 8¼ *d.* per pound on an average.

6679. With regard to foot-and-mouth disease, you say the home animals are unduly favoured in comparison with foreign animals; do you think that if the stoppage of fairs and markets was ordered at any time by the Government, in consequence of foot-and-mouth disease, that would be a fair equivalent to the restrictions which are now put upon foreign cattle?—According to my view of the case, I think you might just as well put up a five-barred gate to stop the wind. I believe it is an atmospherical influence; I believe it to be also infectious or contagious irrespective of that.

Mr. *Jacob Bright*.

6680. You have heard evidence given before this Committee, have you not, that it would be desirable in certain circumstances to shut out all live foreign cattle?—It appears very astonishing to me that such a proposition is made. I feel sure that it could not last long; it could not possibly answer.

6681. But could we not have the meat as dead meat?—From some countries, certainly, you could not, and, at certain times of the year, not from any country in good condition; they cannot send it from Aberdeen in this weather; they do not send it 100 miles in hot weather.

6682. How many months of the year are there in which it does not come from Aberdeen?—It is according to the weather.

6683. You spoke of the atmosphere conveying the disease; do you mean that the atmosphere carries the germs of the disease, or that there is an unhealthy atmosphere which engenders it?—I believe that it engenders it, and I believe that it is also easily carried on the wings of the atmosphere; there have been so many cases where the animals

Mr. *Jacob Bright*—continued.

animals have been perfectly isolated, and yet they have taken this foot-and-mouth complaint.

6684. You are speaking only of foot-and-mouth disease?—Exclusively.

6685. Not of the lung disease?—No; I understood your question to refer to the foot-and-mouth complaint.

Mr. *Dease.*

6686. Am I right in having understood you to say that you have realised as much as 30 *l.* profit on a live beast imported from America?—Certainly not; I have sold them at 30 *l.* per head.

6687. And from that you have deducted 7 *l.* 10 *s.*, which is the cost of bringing them over?—That would have to be deducted; all that I have sold will average 30 *l.* a-piece.

6688. What, then, was the first cost of one of those beasts?—I do not know; they do not let us know.

6689. Then you are not aware what the cost of that beast in America is?—No. I had one American ox that made 56 *l.* last week; I think that if it had been in the Agricultural Hall at Christmas time it would have made 80 *l.* They are our best bred shorthorn beasts, and they are developed in a way in which we do not develop them. Instead of their thighs shelving down, their buttocks are square. Why? Because they get all that extra flesh in the two years after you have done feeding them. It is a subject that I know something about.

6690. Does that arise simply from their greater age?—And from their better feeding. They are not fed upon artificial food, which limits and diminishes the flesh in some cases, but they are fed upon grasses, where the animals themselves grow, and their flesh grows; 40 out of the 90 that I sold yesterday are much squarer than the English beasts.

Mr. *Elliot.*

6691. You said, I think, that American meat landed at Southampton was estimated to have lost 6¾ *d.* per stone in one day's transit?—Yes, that is the evidence that I have from the person who sent it.

6692. Then would not the ordinary meat killed at Southampton, and exposed in hot weather such as we have had lately, deterioriate to something like a similar amount?—In quite hot weather it might. The losses have been fearful sometimes. I have had quantities killed at Southampton in consequence of one or two having the foot-and-mouth complaint, and therefore I know practically how much the loss is. I should say that the oxen which I have been obliged to have killed, have made quite 2 *l.* per head less by being killed at Southampton, instead of coming on to London in the usual way. That is in hot weather.

6693. That was not my question. If there were animals bred at Southampton and killed there, and it took them 24 hours to come up here, in hot weather would it not have the same effect upon them as it had upon this American meat?—No, not the same effect but partially the same. It would not affect it to the same extent, because if this meat comes in process of decomposition an extra day would squash it altogether; but in the case of the fresh beasts that you speak of as being killed at Southampton, it may not have such an injurious effect.

Mr. *Elliot*—continued.

6694. Did I correctly understand you to say that the difference in the price from the first time that you knew the trade, 48 years ago, and now, was, in your opinion, caused by the restrictions and by the increase of the general wealth of the country?—No. I should say that certainly the first cause of the increase of price would be the increase of population, and also the increase of labour that is found for the population.

6695. You do not think, then, that the loss from rinderpest and other diseases from 1842 to 1867, which was about 1,500,000 animals, has had any effect upon the price of meat?—I think that cattle plague had then, certainly.

6696. It has not had any effect, you think, since?—The effect continued, no doubt, because of the cattle having been slain.

6697. Will it not account for the price being depreciated even now, to some large extent, when you consider that there were 1,500,000 animals taken from the breeding stock of the country?—There has been quite time, with perseverance, to have recovered from that which happened eight years ago.

Mr. *King Harman.*

6698. You say that you know that foot-and-mouth disease existed before foreign cattle were imported; how do you know that?—I used to attend the market in Smithfield for several years, five or six years before any beasts were imported from abroad.

6699. That is to say, you began to attend that market about 1833 or 1834?—Yes, about 48 years ago. I have seen quantities of the hoofs of sheep taken up in bushel baskets which had all been thrown off in consequence of foot-and-mouth complaint.

Chairman.

6700. I think it has been quite established that it existed previously to foreign importation?—Yes; I should refer for proof to the evidence before the Committee of the House of Commons.

Mr. *King Harman.*

6701. You import cattle largely from France, I think?—I receive those that are imported.

6702. In 1876 the import from France was 4,445 cattle, and I see that of those 678 were landed with the foot-and-mouth disease; that is to say, more than one-sixth?—A great many came last year from France with the foot-and-mouth disease, or at least they had it before they left Deptford. A great many of them had not it when they got to Deptford, but they very soon took it. The fact is, as I have already mentioned to this Committee, that I have the greatest dislike to covered markets. I dislike the Paris Market exceedingly; any covered market is calculated to do a great deal of harm, and Deptford particularly so; that is my conviction.

6703. More than one-sixth of the French cattle landed last year being reported as having landed with foot-and-mouth disease, you think that they picked it up at the Deptford Market? I know that some would do so. I do not think that proportion came with it; I know that every bullock was marked, and sometimes they do not mark them until some time afterwards, and the place is so impregnated with ailments at Dept-

Mr. *Giblett.*

22 June 1877.

Mr *King-Harman*—continued.

ford that no animal could remain there unsold for three or four days without being much deteriorated. They will not eat after they have been subjected to this disinfecting process.

6704. Are they not examined before they arrive at the Deptford Market?—No, they are not examined until after they arrive.

6705. But they are examined immediately on their arrival, are they not?—No, not immediately; we often have to wait until the next day.

6706. But, of course, this return of the 678 animals affected with foot-and-mouth disease is founded on the report of the inspectors?—I saw a great many that had the foot-and-mouth disease, but they came chiefly from Paris. In Normandy, where the cattle are much finer, they have very little or hardly any foot-and-mouth disease, and I sold large quantities of beautiful beasts from Normandy at 40 *l.* a-piece and upwards last year and for many years; but those beasts that had the foot-and-mouth disease had been travelling about from below the Paris Market.

6707. And consequently they would probably endanger any cattle that might be travelling on the same road, in fact they would be spreading food-and-mouth disease through France?—The same as they would in England going from one county to the other.

Mr. *French.*

6708. What is the general age of the American live stock that come over?—I should say that those that are sent over are generally of very good quality, and they are old beasts, say quite five years of age.

6709. Do you think that it would pay farmers in this country to keep their cattle for such a long time as that?—No.

6710. Do you not think that the cattle that are killed at three years or three and a half years old are sufficiently old to make good beasts?—They certainly make good beasts at three years old, but where they are unduly forced at an earlier age they do lose, I think, both in quantity and in quality.

6711. They do not weigh so heavy as the older beasts?—No, but it is the extraordinarily good grasses that they have in America that make good cattle. Artificial food very often makes beasts fat, but it does not necessarily make them of good quality; it is on the grasses where the flesh is increased.

6712. Do you know anything about the markets in New York?—No, only by what I read in letters.

Mr. *Cameron of Lochiel.*

6713. Do you consider that feeding cattle on oil cake or on Indian corn makes the best beef?—I believe that nothing makes such good meat as the best grasses, but oil cake I should prefer to Indian corn; Indian corn would make the meat harder, I think.

6714. We have had evidence that in America those excellent cattle that you refer to are fed during the last two winters of their feeding on Indian corn?—It is so in winter, I believe; but in the fertile time of the year they have very excellent grass.

6715. You stated that you considered that the

Mr. *Cameron of Lochiel*—continued.

diminution of foreign importation would affect the price of meat, by raising it very considerably?—Very much so; fearfully so, no doubt.

6716. And so far it would affect the supply of meat, and the well-being of the poorer classes, more especially?—Certainly.

6717. Are you aware what proportion the foreign beasts imported alive into this country bear to the home-grown beasts?—I do not know. I have seen some statistics upon the subject. I am more conversant with the quantity which comes to London; I should not have had faith in statistics until I had traced their origin, and the way in which they are formed.

6718. Supposing that you were made aware that the total supply of foreign beasts was very small, say five per cent., compared to the total number of home-grown beasts, would you still adhere to your opinion that it would ruinously affect the interests of the country to stop that supply?—If I heard it so stated I should question its being the fact.

6719. Have you ever taken into consideration the loss to the country by the existence of disease in Great Britain?—I am aware that the cattle plague has caused a most fearful loss, and I have endeavoured to recommend all kinds of serious restrictions in that respect. As regards the foot-and-mouth complaint, I am aware that in the milking cows it must have caused considerable loss, and as regards oxen; but of all the 800,000 oxen that I have had to do with, I have never in my life known one die of the foot-and-mouth complaint.

6720. Do you think that the loss that has been incurred by this country in consequence of cattle disease is greater than the gain which you suppose would be derived by not stopping the importation of cattle?—In answering that question it requires to be separated, inasmuch as the amount of the loss in the case of cattle plague is easily estimated; but the foot-and-mouth complaint I hold to be an English native complaint, and therefore it would not be fair to attribute to that disease losses through disease generally; if we establish the fact that the foot-and-mouth complaint is neither more nor less than a native complaint.

Mr. *Anderson.*

6721. You have stated that in the time during which you have been in the trade there has been a great rise in the price of meat, and you have given a number of reasons for that rise; did it never occur to you that perhaps the depreciation in the value of money had a great deal to do with the apparent rise in the price of meat?—Yes, everything is dearer in proportion; I was going to name that; money is cheaper now in fact.

Colonel *Kingscote.*

6722. I think you yourself do not farm at all?—No.

6723. Have you ever studied veterinary science?—No, but I take the liberty of thinking that I know more about the foot-and-mouth complaint than half the young veterinaries that practice, and I knew all about it before they were born.

6724. I was going to ask you whether your experience of foot-and-mouth disease is derived entirely from your practical experience with fat cattle?—There are a great many come through our

Colonel *Kingscote*—continued.

our hands that are not fat, but my experience is confined to those that come through our hands.

6725. I think you more than once used the word "sound;" you said the cattle from Spain were more sound than our English cattle, and that therefore they realised higher prices; by that word "sound" did you mean that they were perfectly free from foot-and-mouth disease?—No. I know, to our cost, that in consequence of having two or three animals affected in a cargo of 250, we have had to have the whole of them killed and sent up to London in broiling hot weather at a loss of 2 *l.* 10 *s.* per head. That is what I complain of so much.

6726. But you do think that foot-and-mouth disease causes great loss, because, as I understood you, you laughed at foot-and-mouth disease, and you would have no restrictions against foot-and-mouth disease anywhere?—I would have restrictions, but no severe restrictions like that. In Glasgow every week they have the foot-and-mouth complaint; in most counties in England they have foot-and-mouth complaint; and in most markets in England they have the foot-and-mouth complaint, and all the beasts are allowed to go anywhere; but if you put your finger on one foreign animal which is affected out of 300, the whole of the others have to be killed at an immense loss.

6727. But I want to know whether you think that foot-and-mouth disease, whether in France or in Spain, or wherever it is, is not a cause of deterioration to the animal itself?—It is a passing evil; it is a deterioration but not of a malignant character. I have known more money gained by buying beasts with foot-and-mouth disease for grazing (I have bought them myself for other people), than by other beasts that have been bought sound.

6728. Because you have bought diseased cattle upon the chance of their getting better?—Yes; and I bought them for those who wished to try the experiment with them, and they paid immensely. Our chairman, Mr. Leeds, at the Agricultural Hall, whom I have the honour of having something to do with, says, that of all the cattle in the world, those that paid him most were some that he bought with the foot-and-mouth complaint.

6729. I do not quite understand the dealings between you and Messrs. Bell of Glasgow in the American cattle. I suppose I am not asking you more than I ought to ask you, but I conclude that you get a commission for all the live animals that you buy?—Yes, we pay ourselves on those we sell.

6730. Are there two commission agents in the matter, or do they come straight to you?—It appears so. Mr. Samuels and other persons in America consign them to Mr. Bell; his business does not admit of his coming to London, and everything he has he consigns to us.

6731. Then in reality, before the meat gets to the consumer, he has to pay a good deal in profit, not only to the producer, but to the gentlemen to whom it is consigned?—That is often the case; in most counties of England there are persons jobbing about; it goes through half-a-dozen hands.

6732. That tends to work up the price of meat, does it not?—No doubt the middlemen do; even salesmen are a necessary evil.

6733. You complain of the dead meat at Deptford not being able to find a vent; but surely, if the meat is slaughtered at Deptford, or anywhere else, you could bring it away in carts, and distribute it about the metropolis?—The trade is so fluctuating there; sometimes we have no custom at all; last year I had to sell a quantity of French beasts there, which, according to my belief, realised 4 *l.* a head less than they would have made in the London market; the consequence is that they do not continue to send them.

6734. Do you not think that it is much better in every way, in a sanitary point of view, to have the slaughter-houses in one place, like Deptford, than to have a number of little slaughter-houses all over the town?—I wish I might with good grace ask some of you gentlemen to go to Deptford and see it; you would never go twice if you could avoid it.

6735. If you took the roof off Deptford Market, would not that get over the difficulty?—I think that that would be a great improvement; we should get fresh air then, such as it is, in that locality.

6736. Would you not, from a sanitary point of view, advocate having slaughter-houses like there are at Deptford, or at any other place, and doing away with the number of small slaughter-houses in any town?—It is becoming more the practice for the meat to be supplied by the wholesale butchers; they buy large quantities alive, and then at the west end of the town seven out of ten do not come to the London market at all, but buy in meat markets the parts they want.

6737. Taking it altogether, with this American dead-meat trade, increasing so largely, everything tends to a dead-meat trade to the butchers, and hence to the consumers?—Even when beasts come alive from any country it tends to a dead-meat trade, inasmuch as the butchers come to the Metropolitan Central Dead Meat Market at Smithfield and buy it, and it goes off into the different avenues in their carts. The retail butchers buy it because, I presume, the wholesale butchers are more in the habit of buying it alive, and they dress it in an excellent manner.

6738. Supposing that a process were devised by which dead meat from America could always come over in good condition on board steamers, do you not think that it might supply the place of the foreign live-stock import?—It is a very great boon, and by all means get all the meat you can when the weather is cold; but do not depend upon the supply when the weather is hot, because then it cannot come except at an immense loss, and in a state that cannot be good for the senders, and I question whether it is good for the public.

Mr. *Arthur Peel.*

6739. When you said that the price of live cattle in America is now rising as much as 3 *l.* a head, were you speaking of the cattle killed for the dead-meat trade?—I think that this letter which I have read refers to the cattle generally. He would do as he liked about sending them alive or sending them dead. He is speaking of cattle generally rising in price.

6740. Do you think that the quality of the animals slaughtered for the dead-meat trade is equal to the quality of the animals that are sent over here alive?—I have seen them of wonderfully good quality dead; in fact I never saw meat cut better, only the worst of it is that it comes in such a disfigured state, and it looks so unsightly

Mr. *Giblett.*

22 June 1877.

Mr. *Giblett.*

22 June 1877.

Mr. *Arthur Peel*—continued.

unsightly in hot weather. Many persons come to the conclusion, practical men, whose opinion I would rather take than my own on such a subject, because I had rather not buy it exclusively, that it is like fish that has been on ice; it is softened and sodden.

6741. Some witnesses have stated that the dead meat which is sent from America is of an inferior quality; do you believe that?—No; in the cold weather I have had some oxen here weighing 200 stone, which is twice the weight of many of our English beasts. I have seen some quarters weighed, and the ox would weigh 200 stone.

6742. Do you think that it would pay to send as dead meat the valuable cattle of which you have been speaking?—In quite cold weather it has come in good order, but it would be ruinous to send it in such weather as this.

6743. You think that the dead-meat trade will be a winter trade?—Yes.

6744. And that the live importation will be a summer trade?—Yes, until the price gets dearer; but to be dependent upon America for our supplies in England would sound to me most unnational.

6745. Would you state what effect the dead-meat trade has had upon the prices of live cattle in the London market of late?—It came in large quantities, and it very much depressed our trade; but we had so few from abroad besides, that by struggling it made fair prices. It has never gone very low.

6746. Of late weeks has the amount of dead meat increased or diminished?—It has diminished. The price of good English meat and Scotch meat has been very stationary for some time, from 8½*d.* to 9*d.* per lb.; but then the offals are worth so much less money from the English beasts.

6747. How is it that you account for this continued importation of dead meat in the face of these repeated assertions that it is a dead loss?—That is a very natural inquiry; I understand that they have made certain contracts with certain vessels which are fitted up for the purpose of bringing this meat, and, having made those contracts, they continue to bring it irrespective of its being a gain or a loss.

6748. You say that offal is a very necessary article of food for the poor, and that one of the great drawbacks of the dead-meat trade is that we do not get offal?—That is most important; I should have been sorry to omit that, because I consider that the offal is a great blessing to the poor of England.

6749. Have you ever heard of offal coming from America?—I know of offal coming from very much nearer places when it has been in a disgusting state; the sheep's heads and the plucks.

6750. I was asking you about the American trade; do you know of any instance of offal coming from America in a fit state for food?—No; but the offal in a clean state is an immense item of food for the poor; it is not very sightly even then.

6751. You say that you suffered great loss at Deptford from not being able to dispose of the offal; is not the means of transit to Deptford a very simple one?—It was only a depreciation of the value of the offal; I could dispose of it.

Mr. *Chaplin.*

6752. You told the right honourable gentleman, the Member for Bradford, I think, that to prohibit all import of live cattle would ruinously affect the price of meat?—I think so; it would make it ruinously dear.

6753. Would it injuriously affect the profits of your business?—I do not think it would; I think I should turn what little intelligence I have to other branches of business; the dead meat that I receive pays me better than the live meat with the charges that I have made upon it; but I was not going to be troubled with it unless I was well paid.

6754. If the live import was stopped altogether, would that affect the profits of your business?—Yes, it would, certainly; but I do not come here to advocate my own business; I come here as the representative of the importers; in fact, if it had been with the view of advocating my own interest, I would not have asked to come; I come here at the request of Messrs. Hope and Harrington who send me from 5,000 to 10,000 oxen a year, and trust me implicitly with all their stock.

Chairman.

6755. Messrs. Hope and Harrington, I think, are Government contractors?—They are; there were never more beautiful places in the world for lairing cattle than they have.

Mr. *Chaplin.*

6756. You do not believe that the importation of American meat could be carried on successfully in the very hottest weather?—No, I see it all, and I know therefore how it comes, and I know that when it costs 6 *d.* per lb. in America it makes 3 *d.* per lb. here in some cases.

6757. But when it is delivered here in perfect order it makes considerably more than 3 *d.* per pound?—I never saw it in perfect order in hot weather.

6758. But we have had evidence from two or three witnesses, I think, that one cargo of American dead meat was delivered in this country in August last year, in the very hottest weather and in the most perfect condition; you are not aware of that?—No, it did not under my notice. I have seen all that has come this year.

6759. Does the evidence that I speak of tend to shake your opinion at all?—No, I would rather go by what I have seen.

6760. It would not lead you at all to believe that what we were told on Wednesday by Mr. Burkett, was the case, that is to say, that when the cargoes varied it was owing to want of care in the process of preparation on the other side, or to want of attention during the transit, or to some accident to the machinery, and to no other cause?—I heard it, and I questioned it at the time I heard it, because I knew that his experience was very limited.

6761. It does not shake your opinion at all?—Not in the least.

Chairman.

6762. I think you said, in answer to a question which was put to you by an honourable Member, that you were able to speak with regard to the proportions in the London trade, but not with regard to the proportions of the foreign import to the supply of the whole country?—No.

6763. Then, I suppose, what you would represent

Mr. *Giblett.*

22 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

sent to the Committee is that whatever may be the proportion of foreign to English beasts with regard to the general trade of the country, the proportion of the foreign beasts as regards the London supply is very considerable?—It is a majority. A great deal goes to Hull and Edinburgh.

6764. But, as compared to the whole supply to the country, the foreign supply to London is a very large per-centage?—Quite half and more in the case of sheep.

6765. It appears by the figures in the Government reports that, in 1876, 46 per cent. of the total cattle sold in London were foreign animals; therefore the stoppage of this foreign import, in your opinion, would seriously affect the trade in London?—Yes, not merely the population of London, but of the country; for in Brighton they have hardly any meat produced, and in Kent they do not create one-sixth part of what they want.

6766. That brings me to one of the answers which you made to an honourable Member, which was, that England did not produce nearly the amount of stock that it might produce; do you speak of that from your own personal knowledge?—Yes. I am astonished to see the paucity of stock that there is in many counties.

6767. A question has been raised before this Committee as to whether the stock of the country could be very largely increased if the farmers turned their attention to it; many witnesses have stated to the Committee that the grazing power of the country was already fully occupied; that is not your opinion?—No, quite the contrary. An immense number of calves are killed when they are only one month old, or when they are a week old sometimes, and it is a shame whilst they are destitute of stock in the country, that calves should be sacrificed in the way they are.

Chairman—continued.

6768. You stated to the Committee, I think, that, if the farmers turned their attention to it, we might very largely increase the home stock?—Yes; but if you did not get a large supply from abroad, you would be half-starved while you were doing it.

6769. But you admit that the stock in the country is capable of increase to a very great extent?—Yes, and I think the consumption is capable of being doubled; but at the present price poor people cannot get any meat to eat; they must live upon fish, and offal, and refuse.

6770. That is the present price of the home meat, but you are not alluding, I suppose, to the price which the American dead meat has realised?—That is a great boon to them, as they are not able to get any better. I wish, if possible, whilst we are obliged to go to Deptford, that we might not have the market on the same day as at Islington.

6771. You would represent that it is a great inconvenience to the trade that the markets happen on the same day?—A great inconvenience. How can you expect independent men with a great deal of money in their pockets to get there at four or five o'clock in the morning and attend two markets in one day.

6772. Do you believe that if the markets were held on different days, it would produce a larger competition in the Deptford Market?—I believe it would, and much larger in the English market. That is what I felt so much; that the English graziers would go to the wall by the Deptford Market being established, because very often some of our most important men do not come to the English market at all, but prefer to go where they can buy a cheaper meat.

6773. And you think that they are held off the market by the fact of the markets taking place on one day?—Yes, many of them will not go to two markets in one day.

Mr. WILLIAM STRATTON, called in; and Examined.

Mr. *Stratton.*

Chairman.

6774. I BELIEVE you live in Wiltshire?—Yes.

6775. And you are very much interested in the question which is now under the consideration of this Committee?—I am.

6776. Can you speak as to the effect of foot-and-mouth disease, and as to that disease discouraging the keeping of stock in your neighbourhood?—I can. Our county suffers very seriously from foot-and-mouth disease; it is the contagious disease which inflicts the greatest injury upon the stock of our county. I have been a member of the Executive Committee for dealing with contagious diseases in the county of Wilts ever since its first formation, and I have therefore been able to watch the effects of the regulations, and I have had my attention very closely called to them. I have always felt that in making representations to the Government we had not statistical data to lay before the authorities; so that last year I requested the chief-constable, who is the principal officer acting under the Executive Committee, to compile returns as to the number of cattle that had been officially reported to him as affected with foot-and-mouth disease during the last four years in our county. Those returns he has sent to me, and I have them now before me. They are incomplete for two years in consequence of the returns of foot-and-mouth disease not having been made to the Clerk of the Peace for two half years between the 21st of June 1873 and the 10th of June 1874. The regulations as to the returns of foot-and-mouth disease were repealed on the 21st of June 1873, so that no returns were made from that time until the 10th of June 1874, when they were again required; so that the returns that I have beginning on the 1st of January 1872, and extending to the end of December 1875, are only complete for the two years, 1872 and 1875. There are returns for every week of every year separately for each petty sessional division. They show that in the year 1872 there were 37,444 beasts returned as having been infected with foot-and-mouth disease in our county; there were 6,545 pigs so returned, and 113,805 sheep. From the returns issued from the Board of Trade, the total number of head of cattle in our county in June 1871 was 79,350; of pigs 65,000; and of sheep 722,000; so that nearly one-half of our cattle were affected with foot-and-mouth disease in the year 1872, and more than one-sixth of our sheep. The returns are incomplete for 1873 and 1874, and therefore

Chairman—continued.

Mr. *Stratton.*

22 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

I will not quote them; but for 1875 they were again complete. We then had officially returned 24,000 head of cattle, and 5,000 pigs, and 64,000 sheep as having been affected.

6777. Had the stock in the meantime varied at all, or was the Board of Trade return for 1872 applicable to 1875?—The Board of Trade returns have shown a gradual diminution of the number of stock in the country generally; I cannot speak positively as to our own county, but I believe that it would be true as to our county.

6778. You quote those figures as showing how serious has been the effect of foot-and-mouth disease in the county in which you live?—Quite so; our county is largely a dairy district, and the losses there are very frightful.

6779. I suppose by the losses you mean the deterioration of stock, and the losses from the dropping of calves?—The absolute losses by deaths are very much less serious in their effects than the depreciation in the value of the live animals.

6780. I understand that in cases of foot-and-mouth disease the deaths are not very frequent; I suppose you would confirm that?—From foot-and-mouth disease we absolutely lost in 1872, 439 beasts, 851 pigs, and 55 sheep.

6781. Were those lost beasts any of them cows, the dairies being most seriously affected?—They were most seriously affected.

6782. Besides those actual direct losses, I suppose that the depreciation of stock was very considerable?—We could not adopt a closer valuation than 2 *l.* per head on all the animals affected.

6783. Whilst at the same time, from your having to re-prepare your fat stock where they were affected with it, you lost the possibility of feeding off other animals on the farm, which was also a direct loss to the consumer?—Quite so.

6784. With regard to pleuro-pneumonia, what effect has that had upon your cattle?—Pleuro-pnemuonia is a very much less serious disease in our county than the other, and I believe it is so over the whole of England. The returns of pleuro-pneumonia are complete for the four years, and the total number of animals affected in our county during the four years has been only 69; of that number 46 have been slaughtered, and 20 have died; so that the deaths from foot-and-mouth disease have been nearly ten times as numerous in the year 1872, as from pleuro-pneumonia in the years 1872 to 1875 inclusive.

6785. Is there any record of what happened in the other three cases?—There is no record in the official returns as to that.

6786. That would prove that the disease of pleuro-pneumonia has not affected your district so largely by any means as the other disease?—Yes.

6787. What restrictions have you adopted with regard to those diseases during those two years that you have spoken of?—We, in our county, have exercised to their full extent the powers that have been conferred upon us; we have applied the pleuro-pneumonia rules, so far as the law allows, in cases of foot-and-mouth disease; but we complain that the powers do not extend far enough.

6788. What regulations would you suggest as being necessary in order to cope with these diseases?—I am a member of the Central Chamber of Agriculture, and I have represented the southern division of the county of Wilts at that Chamber for the last five years. We have there drawn up a series of recommendations which we have submitted to the Privy Council; and as to that I do not think I could do better than read to you the recommendations which we have made. The last report of the Central Chamber on the subject was made last Christmas, at the end of the year, when these Resolutions were accepted and passed: "1. That all foreign animals intended to be slaughtered for meat should be landed at specified ports, and sent to markets separate from those used for English stock. That all such animals should be branded or marked on landing, and not allowed to be removed alive from the place of debarkation. 2. That proper quarantine grounds should be provided by Government for foreign store stock arriving from unscheduled countries, which stock should not be removed therefrom until seven clear days have elapsed. In the event of contagious diseases breaking out among any lot thus placed in quarantine, the whole should be slaughtered with the least possible delay. Cattle arriving at an English port from any country where pleuro-pneumonia exists should either be slaughtered upon arrival or be immediately inoculated for the disease, and then subjected to a quarantine of not less than 28 days. 3. That, in respect of animals from Ireland or other of the British Isles, so long as such islands are actually free from contagious disease no restriction should be imposed upon exportation or importation; animals coming therefrom should, in all respects, be treated as English, Welsh, or Scotch cattle, or animals arriving coastwise at one British port from another; but, in the event of contagious disease existing in either of these islands, no animals should leave such island until the owner has produced a certificate from the local authority of the district that no contagious disease existed upon the farm or premises, or adjoining farm or premises from which the animals come. Should the animals be unsound, or the owner fail to produce a satisfactory certificate, such animals not to be embarked until they have been subjected to such quarantine as the inspector may order, or in accordance with the rules to be issued by the Privy Council. 4. That all vessels used for the importation of animals be certified by the Board of Trade as to space, ventilation, convenience, &c.; and that regulations for the efficient cleansing and disinfecting of such vessels be issued and rigorously enforced. 5. That, in order to avoid the present diversity of action, all Orders in Council, or legislative enactments bearing upon the trade in disease in animals should be imperative and not permissive; further, that their application should extend throughout the United Kingdom. 6. That a universal system of local officers be established, such officers (farmers or veterinary surgeons) to be armed with powers to enter at all reasonable times upon farms and premises; to order isolation of diseased animals as well as those in contact with them; also to give orders as to the treatment of infected places; the owners of cattle or occupiers of premises to possess the right of refusing admittance to such officers until they have undergone the process of disinfection. 7. That provision be made to secure the practice of inspection throughout the three kingdoms being more thorough; to this end,

Chairman—continued.

end, a sufficient number of qualified men should be appointed by Government to act as itinerant inspectors, who should be charged with the duty of visiting fairs, markets, and ports, to see that local authorities, railway companies, wharfingers, shipping agents, local inspectors, &c., attend to the respective duties imposed on them by Orders in Council or Acts of Parliament. 8. That the owner of any animal affected with a contagious disease should be compelled to give immediate notice of such case to the local officer, nor should such animal, or those which have been in contact, be allowed to be removed, except for the purpose of isolation, until the inspector reports them free from disease. 9. That, upon the outbreak of contagious disease in any locality, the local inspector should have the power of prohibiting the movement of animals without an order, not only from the infected farm or premises, but, subject to the local authority, from any adjoining lands or premises the local inspector may deem requisite. 10. That, whenever foot-and-mouth disease or other contagious maladies become general or dangerously prevalent, it shall be the imperative duty of the Privy Council to order a temporary stoppage of fairs and markets, and prohibition of removal of animals except by license. 11. That, in respect of pleuro-pneumonia, all affected animals should be at once slaughtered, and the hides and offal buried; that when immediate notice has been given compensation be made to the owners at the rate of three-fourths the value of each animal, and the salvage of the carcase to belong to the owner, provided that the compensation and salvage together do not exceed the full value of the animal. That the remainder of the herd be isolated for a period of not less than eight clear weeks."

6789. As I understand, from those regulations which the Chamber proposed, whilst you would suggest restrictions on the foreign trade, you are prepared to submit to more stringent restrictions affecting the home trade?—Quite so.

6790. And speaking not only for the farmers in your county, but as a member of the Chamber of Agriculture, you believe that the farmers generally would be willing to submit to strict regulations?—The Council of the Central Chamber of Agriculture consists of representatives from 51 associated chambers. We have had this subject prominently before us ever since I have been a member, which is now five years, and I think I may say that it is the only subject upon which we are unanimous. I have never heard anybody express an objection to these stringent regulations which we recommend as affecting the home trade.

6791. With regard to more power being taken by the Privy Council in the appointment of inspectors, do you think that the local authority would submit to giving up their power in that matter?—Most certainly, with the greatest pleasure.

6792. Has the question of the remuneration of such a staff as that been considered by the Chamber?—It is the feeling of the Chamber that these regulations, and the consequent expenses, being rendered necessary by the importation of live animals, the cost ought, in all fairness, to be borne by the national exchequer.

6793. But I understand you to say that, with your recommendations as to the appointment of those inspectors, you combine recommendations which would prohibit the importation of live foreign animals altogether?—Yes.

6794. And therefore that plea for the charge being made an Imperial charge would not remain?—We think that the superior officials should be, as I believe they are now, paid by the Imperial exchequer; there are now travelling inspectors.

6795. Then you have not considered the question from the point of view from which Professor Brown looks at it; that is to say, that the whole permanent staff of inspectors should be a staff appointed by the Privy Council in all districts, subject to the authority and orders of the Privy Council, instead of the local authorities appointing their own inspectors in the several districts?—We carry out details through the police; they are paid half by the county and half by the Government.

6796. But Professor Brown's suggestion was that the appointment of the whole inspectors, whether they were the police utilised by the Privy Council for that purpose, or whether they were scientific inspectors, should rest in the Privy Council, for the purpose of bringing about uniformity, and giving the Privy Council a certainty that their instructions were properly carried out; do you believe that that would meet with the approval of the Chamber of Agriculture?—I do, decidedly.

6797. And whilst they suggest that the charge for such inspection should be an Imperial charge on account of the dangers from foreign import, supposing that those dangers were limited in the way that you have suggested, do you think that they would be willing to bear the charges of this inspection, although the system was worked by the Privy Council?—The charge is a secondary consideration as compared with the effects of the disease.

6798. And you think that, with a view of getting rid of the disease at home, the farmers generally would be prepared to submit, not only to those regulations, but, as taxpayers, to the charge for the inspection being placed upon them?—Decidedly.

6799. You have referred to the stoppage of imports of live stock from abroad; has it ever occurred to you, or has it been considered by the Chamber, whether there might be, especially in such a centre of population as London, great difficulty in supplying the dead meat, in consequence of that prohibition, in hot weather?—I have myself seen American meat in the Metropolitan Market last summer, in exceedingly hot weather, in splendid condition. That meat had been killed in America. Therefore I do not think that a difficulty would arise; but, provided that it did, I maintain that the English trade would most rapidly adapt itself to any scarcity of foreign supply in the summer.

6800. How do you mean that it would rapidly adapt itself; do you mean by that that there would be a large increase in the breeding stock throughout the country, and therefore a large increase in the home supply?—There would be a considerable increase in the home supply if we could get rid of these infectious diseases; but the point which I was raising was this: that the English farmers would be able to arrange to bring out their meat at any season they thought proper.

Mr. *Stratton.*

22 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

6801. But the difficulty that occurs to me, in the event of a sudden stoppage of a large supply such as London depends upon, is whether it could be met by a supply of home stock. Although you say that you could adapt the home stock supply to the particular season when it was wanted, I imagine that there would still be a deficiency to the extent of the foreign import until you had bred up to the greater supply required?—No; if we found that there was a difficulty in getting foreign meat to London in the summer, we should expect the price to rise in the summer to a slight degree, perhaps to the extent of one halfpenny per pound. The result would be that we should arrange to bring our cattle into the market at the hottest season of the year, when the foreigners do not so sharply compete with us.

6802. As I understand you, you wish to stop the import of live animals altogether?—Yes.

6803. And if that diminished, as it has been stated to us that it would, the supply from abroad, on account of its driving a very large portion of that supply into other markets, would your home supply, even if it were sent into the market at a different time, be sufficient at its present amount to meet that loss?—The production of English meat could and would be increased to an enormous extent.

6804. But there would be a time, when you first suffered the loss of the foreign import, before you had bred up to the fresh requirements; and then there would be a rise in prices, would there not?—No; I do not think there would.

6805. I suppose you would point to the fact that this American dead-meat supply during the months when the foreign supply has been restricted on account of the cattle plague regulations, met the gap which was made by that loss?—Quite so. About the beginning of January, when the cattle plague broke out, there was a sudden stoppage of importation of German and Dutch beasts; you would have imagined that that would have raised the price of meat in the Metropolitan Market; but, on the contrary, meat was not at all dearer for the next month after that sudden cessation of the foreign supply than it had been before.

6806. Was that in consequence of the Deptford Meat Market being more largely supplied?—I imagine so.

6807. I suppose the months in which the cattle plague regulations were in force, were those months in which we were not so much dependent upon the foreign supply, because they were the colder months?—I am not aware that we get fewer in January than in the other months.

6808. The Schleswig-Holstein supply, for instance, does not come in until after the grass season; and that forms a large portion of the German supply, at all events; but still you represent that the growth of the home stock, together with the dead-meat trade, would prevent the rise of prices to the consumer by the restrictions which might possibly drive away the foreign cattle?—Yes.

6809. With regard to cattle plague, I suppose you would be prepared to submit to any regulations or restrictions centering in the Privy Council authority for dealing with that disease?—Certainly.

6810. Is there any other point which you wish to put before the Committee?—I have been very much surprised at the statement of the authorities of the Veterinary Department of the Privy Council, that farmers would not submit to severe restrictions. I have every opportunity of knowing what the opinion of farmers throughout the country is, and my experience has been that every farmer wishes for much more stringent regulations than we have yet had.

6811. As you have already stated, that the farmers generally, not only in your own county, but from your knowledge as a member of the Chamber which represents nearly the whole of England, throughout the country, are quite prepared to submit to stringent regulations for the purpose of getting rid of diseases which affect them so seriously?—Yes; and whenever we get an outbreak of rinderpest and the restrictions consequent upon it, we always get a great diminution in the prevalence of foot-and-mouth disease.

6812. Your experience, of course, extends over the time of the first outbreak of cattle plague in England?—Yes, I have been a member of the Contagious Diseases Committee for 12 years.

6813. As such you can endorse the evidence of other witnesses, that the regulations which have been enforced in that time have very much diminished the foot-and-mouth disease?—Very decidedly so, and at the present time we have no foot-and-mouth disease in the county of Wiltshire; we are more free from that disease than we have been for six or seven years.

6814. Notwithstanding the figures which you have given of the way in which it has decimated your herds, you believe that the disease has ceased in consequence of these few months' strict regulations?—Very much so.

6815. And you point to that and to other experience as evidence in favour of the possibility of stamping out the disease?—Quite so.

6816. Do you believe that the disease is sometimes not inbred in the animal, but produced by the condition of the animal?—I am quite certain that it can only be conveyed by contagion.

6817. That is your own practical experience?—Yes, as well as the result of my reading veterinary authorities.

6818. But you are not aware of its having broken out in your district in the way that it has been stated to have broken out in other places in England?—It has often broken out without my being able to trace the way in which it came, but I have never doubted for a moment that it was conveyed by contagion.

6819. You think that it may have been brought in the way that has been suggested to this Committee, either by dogs or by other animals passing over the ground from an infected district?—Quite so. If my neighbour gets foot-and-mouth disease, I know there are ten chances to one that I shall get it too, although there may be two or three roads between us. It is conveyed by birds, and hares, and rabbits, and every thing.

6820. Is there anything else that you would like to point out to the Committee?—I wish to point out that the prevalence of contagious diseases here closes the world against our exporting animals.

6821. You represent that another great cause of loss to the agriculturist here is, that these diseases prevent his export trade of high-bred animals?—Quite so; and, as a consequence, they prevent the improvement of the continental stock. It has been stated in evidence here that the continental

Chairman—continued.

continental stock is very much inferior to the American stock; but my father did a great trade in sending animals to France, and Germany, and Hungary 10 or 15 years ago, of the improved shorthorn breed; that trade has been completely destroyed by the prevalence of disease in this country. The whole world is closed against our stock now.

6822. And until we get in this country freedom from these diseases, those restrictions act prejudicially on our trade?—Yes, as well as prejudicially on the improvement of the meat which would be imported.

Major *Allen.*

6823. In reference to the dairy counties, foot-and-mouth disease is most disastrous, is it not?—Yes.

6824. And, from your experience, do you think that those farmers carrying on that particular branch of business, viz., a dairy business, would submit to anything in the world for the purpose of getting rid of that disease?—Most decidedly I do.

6825. They do not think that it is an unfair thing on the part of the Government to place those restrictions on foreign cattle, if the farmer himself is prepared to submit to any restrictions on home cattle?—Decidedly. The English farmer would only submit to those restrictions on the chances of a fresh importation of disease being prevented by slaughter or quarantine.

Mr. *Arthur Peel.*

6826. It is generally observed, is it not, that foot-and-mouth disease dies out almost entirely when the regulations for cattle plague are in force?—Certainly.

6827. You would not advocate, therefore, that regulations against cattle plague should be continued in the absence of cattle plague?—I would recommend that such regulations as I have submitted to the Chairman should be continuous.

6828. Are they pretty nearly as stringent as those for cattle plague?—They do not extend to slaughter, but that is the only point upon which they are less stringent.

6829. When you say that the whole world is closed against our stock, on account of what diseases is it so closed?—On account of foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia; Australia has prohibited the importation for some years, and I believe that the Continent has done so too.

6830. Is it not only on account of cattle plague?—At present perhaps it is.

6831. Therefore you would have them admit our cattle when there was no cattle plague, but you would not take theirs so long as any foot-and-mouth disease or pleuro-pneumonia remained in any of those countries?—I would take them under quarantine, and they might take ours under quarantine.

6832. In the absence of cattle plague?—In the absence of cattle plague.

6833. If there was pleuro-pneumonia or foot-and-mouth disease in those countries, you would admit them?—Yes, under quarantine.

Colonel *Kingscote.*

6834. You have suffered from foot-and-mouth disease yourself?—Yes, a great many times.

Colonel *Kingscote*—continued.

6835. Would you like to take 2 *l.* a head for every milch-cow that you had that was attacked with foot-and-mouth disease?—In the case of milking cows being attacked with foot-and-mouth disease in the summer, the losses would be 5 *l.* per head; but if I had a number of young stock affected with the disease, the loss would roughly average 2 *l.* a head.

6836. You have very severe losses both in milk and in the cows not getting in calf again?—Yes.

6837. Do you think that the fear of disease prevents the farmers breeding so much as they otherwise would?—I am sure it does to a great extent.

6838. Do you think that the country could stand more stock?—Enormously more stock. The agricultural returns show that the production of stock has fallen off very materially within the last four or five years, and, as that has been a period of low prices for corn, as a matter of course the farmers would have increased their stock if the price had been remunerative; but the price is not remunerative, and the only thing that has made it unremunerative has been the prevalence of contagious diseases, and more especially of foot-and-mouth disease.

6839. Have you not traced foot-and-mouth disease very much in the neighbourhood of a railway; for instance, in your own country has it not gone along the railway to Chippenham, from which place there is a quick access to a big market like Bristol?—In our county it has been nearly always brought from Bristol market; and we always know when we are about to have a serious attack of it; as soon as one cargo of infected beasts is brought into Bristol, we are sure to have a succession of infected cargoes. The diseases break out in those animals about three or four days after they are landed. I believe the Irish beasts when they are put on board the boats are perfectly healthy, but the period of incubation being about four days, you find about the third or fourth day after the beasts come off the boats that they have the disease, and they come into our county, and spread the disease.

Mr. *Anderson.*

6840. This importation to Bristol is all from Ireland, is it not?—It is all from Ireland.

6841. And you say that they are perfectly sound when they are put on board in Ireland?—The first cargo that contains infected animals infects the boats, and then all the others that pass through that boat become impregnated by means of the saliva from those.

6842. Then better regulations for the transport of those animals will stop that?—I believe that with better regulations for cleansing ships for the transport of animals it might be prevented.

6843. Then that would do quite as well as stopping the importation, would it not?—We do not wish to stop the importation of Irish cattle.

6844. Although it is from Irish cattle that foot-and-mouth disease comes?—Yes, it is from want of attention to details.

6845. We have had similar evidence about the transport of animals from Ireland from a number of different witnesses; is it your opinion that both pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease are distinctly imported diseases?—They were originally distinctly imported diseases.

Mr. *Stratton.*

22 June 1877.

Mr. *Anderson*—continued.

6846. Do you think that if you got quit of them in this country you would not get them back again, supposing that importation was stopped?—I think that if any escape the quarantine we should be able to isolate them and destroy the disease.

6847. Would not the disease break out in this country if there was no importation?—Certainly not, if we destroyed all the germs in this country.

6848. Did we never have pleuro-pneumonia or foot-and-mouth disease before we had foreign importation?—No, not before the importation of raw hides was allowed; it may have been in that way, or it may have been in other ways that the disease was first imported; I know not.

6849. You do not believe that it could break out of itself among cattle, simply because it is a cattle disease pertaining to cattle?—Certainly not; I believe that it must be conveyed by germs in the same way as small-pox from some place or other; I believe that the scientific theory of it accords with my experience and practice.

Mr. *John Holms.*

6850. Have you as much trouble with imported sheep as with imported cattle?—Sheep scab and foot-and-mouth disease are very prevalent in imported sheep, I believe.

6851. But you do not find that they interfere with you so much as disease in cattle?—Cattle are more liable to foot-and-mouth disease than sheep.

6852. You say that you have considerable power to extend your breeding and growth of cattle; could you not extend your breeding and growth of sheep in preference to cattle if you find less disease amongst them?—The statistics which I have read show that the losses in sheep are only a little less serious than in cattle; they are very frightful; one-sixth of our sheep were affected in the year 1872.

Mr. *French.*

6853. In one of those rules which you read out just now, you said that you would be in favour of sending foreign animals to a market separate from English stock; do you mean that you would create a new market solely for the sale of foreign stock?—There is a market already existing at Deptford which we think ought to have all foreign cattle sent to it.

6854. You would not allow any importation of stores from any continental country?—Yes; I would have a quarantine station established at certain ports to be defined by the Privy Council, in the same way as has already been done at Southampton with regard to the importation of stores from France. There is a quarantine station at Southampton which has been in use for some time with regard to the French importation.

6855. Have you seen any of those boats that are complained of, that came into Bristol from Ireland?—I have never been down into the holds of them, but I can tell from the state of the cattle when they are landed that they suffer frightful hardships.

6856. I believe that a great many of them are carried on deck?—I believe that the greater part of them are carried in the hold; it would be less objectional if they were carried on deck.

Mr. *French*—continued.

6857. Do you think that there is more foot-and-mouth disease existing in Ireland than in England?—No, I do not.

6858. Then how do you account for foot-and-mouth disease always coming to you from Ireland?—Because if you only put five or six infected animals on board an Irish boat the saliva from those five or six beasts will so impregnate that boat that all the others that pass through the boat contract the disease; I believe they are infected not in Ireland but in the boat.

6859. You think that, by the boats being properly regulated as to disinfection when they have landed the cattle, you would prevent all that?—I do; I believe you might have a safe trade with Ireland.

6860. Have the Bristol authorities no power at present to deal with such a matter as that?—They do not care to exercise it if they have.

6861. Then it is the fault of your own local authorities?—Yes, a great deal. We ask that the Government shall override those authorities in such matters.

6862. Do you think that the restrictions which are at present in force with regard to cattle plague would stamp out foot-and-mouth disease altogether after awhile?—I think they would if they were applied.

6863. Do you think that it would be possible to prevent the spread of foot-and-mouth disease by those restrictions, in view of the fact that it is spread about by birds and animals, and those sort of things that you cannot stop?—Those returns which we have collected in the county of Wilts show that the disease always reaches the minimum in the spring, that is to say, after the cattle have been in yards comparatively isolated during the winter; and immediately the contact is established in the fields by the stocking of the pastures it spreads and reaches the maximum about the end of September, and the cattle are then brought back into the sheds and the disease gradually decreases again.

6864. You do not think that the weather has anything to do with it?—I think that animal life is more active in the summer, and that there are more vehicles which convey the contagion; birds are more numerous, and flies may carry it over a hedge from one herd to another.

Mr. *Chamberlain.*

6865. You gave some statistics of your losses in Wiltshire; do you know whether they are proportionate in other counties, or do you suffer more in Wiltshire than they do in other counties?—I believe it is a fair specimen of the losses in pastoral districts. Perhaps I should qualify that by saying that it is a fair specimen of the losses in such districts as are in the line of the traffic of cattle. In Cornwall and Devonshire, which is a breeding district, and imports very few beasts, it is very rare indeed.

6866. But in what you call a pastoral district, it would not be an unusual thing that half the cattle should be down in a single year with foot-and-mouth disease?—It would certainly not be an unprecedented thing.

6867. I understood you to say in answer to the Chairman, that whilst you thought that the cost of these regulations might be borne by the National Exchequer, still, if Parliament should think otherwise, the farmers as taxpayers would have

Mr. *Chamberlain*—continued.

have no objection to bear the cost themselves?—I believe they would not object.

6868. I understood you to say that so long as Ireland was proved to be free from disease you would impose no restrictions at all on imports of cattle from Ireland?—No.

6869. But Ireland during the last 10 years has never been free from foot-and-mouth disease, has it?—Ireland has never been free from pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease. The regulations are that we should require a license.

6870. Therefore during the whole of that period your regulations would apply?—Yes, they would apply during the whole of that period.

6871. I understand that those regulations involve a certificate or license before any cattle can be embarked?—Yes.

6872. What would be the purport of that certificate?—That certificate would affirm that neither foot-and-mouth disease, nor pleuro-pneumonia, nor cattle plague existed on the farm or premises from which the animals were removed, or on any adjoining farm or premises.

6873. Do you think that that would be a sufficient security?—I am satisfied that that regulation would have the effect of preventing the importation of disease.

6874. Would not similar regulations be sufficient for all movement of cattle in this country?—Certainly.

6875. You would say, then, that cattle should be freely moved, subject to a certificate given by the proper inspector that the disease did not exist on the premises from which the cattle came, or on any neighbouring premises?—Certainly.

Mr. *Ritchie.*

6876. I understood from the first recommendation which you read that you were willing that cattle should be imported alive, and slaughtered at the point of debarkation?—Our Chamber has always held that point, because we thought that we were more likely to get that than slaughter at the port of embarkation. We have only asked for the minimum which we thought was required. We should prefer slaughter at the port of embarkation.

Chairman.

6877. I understood your answer to me to be that you adhered, and that the Chamber adhered, to those resolutions which you have passed?—Yes, as a minimum which would be satisfactory.

Mr. *Ritchie.*

6878. That recommendation does not agree with what you now said as to the entire prohibition of live animals?—I do not ask for that; I ask that they shall be all slaughtered on landing.

6879. But I understood you to say that you now wished to have them stopped altogether?—No. We should prefer it, but we do not demand that as a minimum. Our policy has always been to ask for as little in the way of restriction as we think can be borne.

6880. If foreign animals were stopped from coming to this country alive, do you say that you do not believe that there would be any rise in the price of meat, even for a time?—Yes, the result has proved it. During the month of January there was a total cessation of the import of German stock, and of nearly all continental stock, I believe; yet there was no rise; the markets were lower in January than in December.

Mr. *Ritchie*—continued.

6881. Do you know what proportion of live and dead meat comes into the London market?—I do not; I believe that the proportion of foreign meat that comes into London is very great.

6882. I find that the number of cattle which were imported into London in 1876 was 147,536, which gives about 2,840 head weekly; I think it has been stated by a witness here that the quantity of American meat which comes into the London market is about 200 or 250 tons weekly; and that, multiplied by three, would give about 600 or 700 carcases; so that if that be true, the proportion is about 700 dead carcases to 2,840 live animals. Do you not think that the stoppage of that large quantity of live animals would very seriously affect the meat supply of the country?—Certainly not, because the meat can be as easily sent dead as alive from the Continent. I know that there is a great trade in dead meat from most of the ports across the Channel to London. I can go into the London market, and ask the salesmen where the meat comes from, and one lot comes from Cherbourg, another from Havre, or from this or the other port on the other side of the Channel. If the foreign cattle trade is prohibited, we shall have a trade in dead meat; that always comes, and I hope that it will increase ultimately.

6883. Do you not think that it would take some time to increase it?—Not a bit.

6884. Have you heard the evidence of those who export live animals from the Continent?—Yes, and I have contrasted it with the evidence of those who send the dead meat, and they neutralise each other

6885. Can you tell me what quantity of dead meat comes from the Continent weekly?—I cannot give you the figures, because I have not prepared myself with them, but I know that they are before you.

Mr. *King Harman.*

6886. You say that you would place Ireland in the same category as England with regard to the removal of cattle; I suppose you would put the two countries strictly upon an equality, and impose the same restrictions upon the import of English calves into Ireland, as you would impose upon the importation of Irish stores into England?—Decidedly; I think that with equal treatment, the two countries would be on the same footing.

6887. Are you aware that there is a considerable import from Wiltshire and Cheshire of English calves into Ireland?—Yes.

Mr. *Assheton.*

6888. Were you farming at the time that the rinderpest was all over the country some 12 years ago?—Yes, I was.

6889. Do you remember whether the farmers at that time complained at all about the restrictions which were put upon the movement of cattle?—When the rinderpest first came, there was a great panic; we had no Cattle Diseases Act, and most arbitrary measures were adopted. For instance, the movement of cattle from one farm to another was absolutely prohibited when there was no cattle plague within very many miles; and the results were very injurious. The

Mr. *Stratton.*

22 June 1877.

Mr. *Stratton.*

22 June 1877.

Mr. *Assheton*—continued.

regulations were such as were not by any means justifiable, and were not by any means necessary.

6890. Did the farmers complain?—They did in such cases.

6891. Do you know whether one source of inconvenience at that time was the fact that the regulations were so various in neighbouring places?—Yes, that was the case. Each county did as it thought proper.

6892. At one time, I think, each county and each borough was its own local authority?—Yes, and a great deal of dissatisfaction arose on account of that great diversity of order. The movement of cattle was at first absolutely prohibited. I had two farms at the extreme corner of the county of Wilts, and I had a lot of beasts on one farm in one corner of the county which I was not allowed to move anywhere; but after a time licenses were granted for the movement of cattle, and then after that there was no more complaint.

Mr. *W. E. Forster.*

6893. I think I understood you to say that the prohibition of the live animals coming in this spring, in consequence of cattle plague, has had but little effect upon the price of meat?—Yes.

6894. Are you not aware that that prohibition only extended to a very small proportion of the animals that are imported?—It was extended to Germany and Holland, I think, to begin with.

6895. If you turn to the Table XVII. of the last Privy Council Report for 1876, you will find that the total number of cattle imported from everywhere, except from America, was about 274,000?—Yes.

6896. The import of cattle from Russia has been stopped for a very long time, and the cattle from Germany, from France, and from Belgium are also stopped; I think you will observe that the cattle from Belgium are under 7,000, and the cattle from France are under 5,000?—Yes.

6897. The cattle from Germany are about 70,000?—Yes.

6898. I suppose you are aware that by far the largest proportion of the cattle from Germany come from Schleswig-Holstein, after this time of the year?—Yes.

6899. Therefore, if those figures are correct, the prohibition of the impórt of live cattle will have affected only a small proportion of the imports?—I was under the impression that at that time the supply of foreign stock into London was very much curtailed by the Orders in Council.

6900. But looking at those figures you will see that the countries from which the imports come are those countries the imports from which, with the exception of Germany, bear but a small proportion to the total import; and that the German import is known not to come in until later in the year?—I was not aware of that.

6901. Are you not aware that several witnesses, both the exporters from Schleswig-Holstein and the salesmen and others who receive the cattle, have told us that the largest amount of that import comes in after this season?—I was not aware of that.

6902 I understand you still to adhere to the regulations that were suggested to the Privy Council by the Chamber of Agriculture in 1876?—Yes.

6903. Those regulations are, shortly, that all foreign fat animals should be slaughtered at the port of landing, that foreign store animals should be quarantined, and that the regulations with regard to home animals should be made much more stringent as to foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia?—Yes.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

6904. Therefore your Chamber has never committed itself to asking for the slaughter of animals at the port of embarkation?—I think that, since that has been issued, we have passed a resolution in favour of slaughter at the port of embarkation, but it has never been entered in the yearly reports; we should prefer slaughter at the port of embarkation.

6905. But, however, you, with your experience, adhere to those suggestions?—Yes, as the minimum that would be acceptable.

6906. Those recommendations having been sent to the Lord President, you received a reply, did you not, written by Mr. Wilmot on behalf of the Duke of Richmond, dated the 11th of November 1876?—Yes.

6907. Will you hand in that reply?—I will do so. (*The same was handed in,* see *Appendix.*)

6908. I see that the Report of the Central Chamber of Agriculture for 1876 states that "The Council suggests that this reply be considered at the first meeting in the new year;" was it so considered?—Yes, I have the report of that.

6909. Will you hand that in also?—Yes. We considered it on 12th February. (*The same was handed in,* see *Appendix.*)

6910. I think, I gather from what you have said, that although your Chamber would like to have the cattle slaughtered at the port of embarkation, yet the actual practical request that they make is the same that is contained in these recommendations of 1876?—That is my feeling about it.

6911. With regard to this Chamber of Agriculture we all know that it is a very important body; but can not you tell us a little of its constitution. You speak of representative members, how are they elected to it?—Each Associated Chamber sends deputies to the Council Meeting in London and it is composed of deputies from all parts.

6912. How are the Associated Chambers themselves formed?—Any members who subscribe to a Local Chamber, are supposed to form a Local Chamber, but that Chamber is only admitted into association with the Central Chamber on its paying a subscription qualifying it to send members.

6913. How many members have you in your Associated Chamber at Wiltshire?—We have 150 members in the South Wiltshire Chamber, which pays 10 *l.* a year as a contribution to the funds of the Central Chamber; and that entitles us to send three deputies; but in point of fact we send two.

6914. When you speak of the willingness of farmers to assent to very stringent regulations, of course your knowledge is mainly based upon the opinions of the members of the Chamber?—Yes.

6915. Should I be wrong in supposing that the members of the Chamber are the most public-spirited gentlemen amongst the farmers, and those who would be the most willing to submit to sacrifices; and that it is not quite clear that all the farmers in the country would be willing to submit to the regulations that members of the Chamber would be willing to submit to?—I do not

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

not think you would be right in that assumption, because in case the farmers of England objected to what was done by the Central Chamber, they would certainly send somebody to oppose those resolutions.

6916. Taking the farmers generally throughout the country, do you think that they realise to themselves what would be the meaning of the very stringent regulations that you would suggest with regard to foot-and-mouth disease?—Yes, indeed; because they have practical experience of it.

6917. I see that we had the pleasure of seeing you before our Committee in 1873?—Yes.

6918. At that time you were strongly in favour of more stringent regulations against foot-and-mouth disease; and you said that, having reduced it to a low point, you would then adopt more stringent measures and treat it as cattle plague; that is to say, you would slaughter all cattle affected with it?—Yes.

6919. Do you still hold that view?—I still think that that would be the most economical and the best mode of dealing with it.

6920. You think that the farmers would assent to that?—Certainly. Take our case now in the county of Wilts; we have only one infected farm, and in that case, I believe, it is a pig that is affected; but supposing it to be an animal worth 20 *l.*, we could not make a better outlay than by slaughtering that animal, and getting the disease out of the county altogether. In the last case we had disease brought into my immediate neighbourhood by a small farmer and dealer who bought three beasts in Bristol, and brought them into the parish of East Knoyle, and caused all those frightful losses in the Shaftesbury district, which were brought before the Duke of Richmond at the time when the regulations with reference to preventing foot-and-mouth disease were proposed. If we had clubbed together and killed those three beasts we should have made an excellent investment.

6921. I am asked by one of the members of the Committee to ask you this: Are not the proceedings of the Chamber of Agriculture fully reported in the county newspapers?—Yes.

6922. Do you think that, taking your own district, there are fewer cattle bred than there were 10 years ago?—Yes, I believe there are.

6923. And fewer sheep also?—Fewer sheep, decidedly.

6924. Then what is done with the land?—Corn is grown in preference, and some hay is sold, and straw is sold.

6925. The difference in the number of cattle that are sold for slaughter does not at all arise, does it, from there being greater demand for milch cattle?—I am speaking of the production of cattle. The cattle in our county would be very largely milch cattle.

6926. Once or twice I have heard it suggested that the diminution in the number of cattle sold for slaughter may be to some extent accounted for by the greater demand for milk; do you think that is so?—I do not think so.

6927. You think that foot-and-mouth disease is, in fact, only carried by contagion now?—I do.

6928. Has it never occurred to you, when one hears about disease being only conveyed by contagion, that there is a difficulty, upon that principle, in accounting for the first beginning of the disease?—I do not see any difficulty about it. Every kind of disease must have had an origin, but it is not a fresh spontaneous origin.

6929. You do not think that because there may be a great deal of contagion there may be certain conditions of traffic of animals, or of the atmosphere that might bring about the disease spontaneously?—I am satisfied of the contrary.

6930. Are you aware that there are a great number of persons of great practical experience who do not agree with you upon that point?—All scientific authorities, I think, concur in my view of the case, and I believe that their authority must be very much greater than that of what you call a practical man, which perhaps is another word for an ignorant man.

6931. My question was with regard to practical men?—Practical men are very ignorant of scientific principles, and because they cannot see the way in which the contagion is conveyed, they perhaps do not believe that it can be done. It is a most illogical conclusion upon their part.

6932. You do not think that animals by being put out on very damp ground in very foggy weather would be very likely to get into a condition which brought about foot-and-mouth disease?—Certainly not; I am quite satisfied about that.

Sir *George Jenkinson.*

6933. The Right honourable Gentleman, the Member for Bradford, asked you with regard to the opinions of the Central Chamber and the representatives there, and whether you considered that they fairly represented the opinions of the farmers, and whether they had any other channels of communicating those opinions; is it not a fact that you constantly meet farmers at markets and other places where farmers meet, and that you have an opportunity of learning their opinions there?—Repeatedly; I meet farmers daily and weekly; constantly.

6934. And you think that the result is that you are justified in saying that the farmers were and are prepared to submit to stringent regulations for the purpose of stamping out disease?—I hear but one opinion about it, and that is, that they are in favour of very stringent measures.

6935. Although you complained of the stringent measures which were imposed at the first outbreak of cattle plague, I think I have heard you give expression to the opinion that it did more to eradicate all other disease than anything else?—Quite so. I have often maintained that those outbreaks of rinderpest are a great benefit to the country, because the measures that are adopted to stop rinderpest stop other diseases too, and our losses are far less in times of rinderpest than when we have no rinderpest.

Mr. *W. E. Forster.*

6936. You would not agree with those who say that the present high price of meat is owing to the effect of cattle plague in 1865?—Certainly not altogether owing to that.

6937. I rather gather from what you say that things were made better by cattle plague?—During that period. Take this year, for instance. Our losses this year will be far less from cattle diseases, although we have had rinderpest than they were last year when we had not it.

Professor JOHN GAMGEE, called in; and Examined.

Professor *Gamgee.*

22 June 1877.

Chairman.

6938. YOU have been for a long time interested in the question of the diseases of cattle?—I have devoted my whole life to it.

6939. You have now, for some time, no longer been connected, I think, with any official work in regard to it?—I have never ceased to labour at the means whereby we might secure the extermination of cattle diseases.

6940. You gave very valuable evidence before the Committee that sat in 1873?—I gave evidence before that Committee.

6941. And before that Committee you expressed an opinion, I think, that foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro pneumonia were of foreign origin?—I did.

6942. I think that, before that Committee, you gave evidence also with regard to the question of prices, and you said that the restrictions which had been in force up to 1839 had lowered those prices; that they were high in 1800; but that, notwithstanding an increase of population, they went steadily down?—I did.

6943. You then believed that the home trade would increase if proper restrictions were imposed as against disease, and that more meat could be produced by the home supply in a couple of years than would be required even if you stopped the foreign import?—Quite so.

6944. Then I think you stated to the Committee that you endorsed the opinion which has been expressed by several of the witnesses before this Committee, that the restrictions which were put in force in 1865 had stamped out the disease, showing that we have the power of getting rid of the disease by proper restrictions?—We stamped out rinderpest, and nearly, if not completely, effected the extermination of foot-and-mouth disease. We were left with pleuro-pneumonia in the large dairies, and the moment the restrictions were removed we were again flooded by foot and-mouth disease, although rinderpest was kept out.

6945. I think that before that Committee you mentioned the question of dairies, and you spoke very strongly as to those dairies being liable to throw a good deal of disease into the markets?—The first observations that I ever made on cattle disease were with respect to the London dairies, which I am sorry to say continue to-day as infected as they were in 1850 and 1851.

6946. I think, going on with the summary of your evidence, you then stated that in your opinion there ought to be the least possible interference with the home trade, and that the foreign trade should be dealt with rationally, so as to foster its growth in a proper way?—Quite so.

6947. I think you stated that you would unite the whole veterinary profession in an effort to carry out these restrictions?—Quite so.

6948. And you recommended that inspection should be allowed by Act of Parliament, with the power of enforcing any regulations which might be suggested?—That was my opinion.

6949. You recommended, I think, slaughter at the ports, unless, I think you said, a more rational system could be introduced, such as was known in the Aberdeen dead-meat trade?—Quite so. Since 1873 I have become impressed with the

Chairman—continued.

fact that the rational method of dealing with the question is by the abolition of the live-stock imports under such conditions as I may afterwards explain.

6950. Your opinion was in favour of quarantining store cattle under certain regulations?—Certainly.

6951. And you foreshadowed in those days what has now taken place; that is to say, the dead-meat trade under the process of cold atmospheric influence?—I first demonstrated the method of cooling meat in 1869.

6952. You stated before the Committee of 1873 that dead meat could be brought, in your opinion, on a 14 or 15 days' voyage, but that it certainly could on a five or six days' voyage?—Yes, certainly.

6953. And that artificial cold would be the means, or ought to be the means, by which it would be brought, that artificial cold not being necessarily from the ice itself, but being produced by machinery?—Quite so.

6954. And you quoted in support of that the fact that the fish brought from the Doggerbank were treated in that way?—Yes; quite so.

6955. That being a very short and imperfect summary of your evidence on many points which have been under the consideration of this Committee, I should like to ask you whether, since the date of 1873, you have still continued to devote a good deal of attention to this subject?—I have devoted my time entirely to the subject.

6956. Have you since then come to any different conclusions from those which you expressed before that Committee beyond the one which you have just stated, viz., that you now believe that the import of cattle ought to be prohibited?—All that I have been able to learn from day to day, and from month to month, and from year to year, is simply a confirmation of that which I stated then.

6957. You have seen the dead-meat trade, which you suggested, developing itself?—I have.

6958. And you are still of opinion that slaughter at the ports should be made obligatory unless that dead-meat trade, which you consider a more reasonable one, could be adopted?—If I may be allowed to explain, I naturally desire the most absolute freedom of trade consistent with the prevention of contagious diseases. Taking all the causes of cattle mortality in this kingdom together, for one animal that dies from all those combined causes, at least three British animals are killed by the imported international cattle diseases which did not exist prior to the importation of live cattle; so that really 75 per cent. of the total mortality of cattle in this country is due to international or foreign cattle disease, and in round figures 25 per cent., or certainly not more than 30 per cent. all told, is indigenous disease, or accident destroying our stock. It is perfectly clear that in the finest meat-producing country in the world such a state of things ought not to be sanctioned.

6959. When you say that 75 per cent. is imported disease, do you mean those diseases which have been imported during the years since 1842?—Quite so. On this point there is a very interesting

Chairman—continued.

resting fact: We constantly hear cattle dealers, the "practical men" that are mentioned, state that we have a great deal more disease here than we find amongst the imported, say, the Spanish cattle. The fact is that a single animal bringing in foot-and-mouth disease, or a single disease-germ, contaminates a very large number of animals which are being bred constantly in this country, and which are found fresh and susceptible to the disease, and for that reason we have under our eyes constantly an immense evil, which would be perfectly controlled by the exclusion of the disease-germ.

6960. Are you speaking now of the diseases generally, or are you limiting your remarks to foreign cattle disease?—To the foreign cattle diseases; to the epizootics proper.

6961. Do you think that that applies to foot-and-mouth disease?—Clearly. Why do we clamour for restrictions in Ireland? We contaminate Ireland, and we naturally get back with compound interest what we give to her.

6962. But there the restrictions do not exist. I suppose you admit that foot-and-mouth disease is easily detected, and shows itself in a very short period, the incubation not being of long duration?—Yes.

6963. The restrictions that exist with regard to the foreign import do show that a disease like foot-and-mouth disease, which is not of long incubation, and which is therefore more under the control of the Veterinary Department, is detected in probably most of the cargoes in which it comes to this country?—And with what result?

6964. The result being that if the disease is detected the diseased animal is killed and the other animals with him, so that they are prevented from becoming centres of a fresh outbreak in the country?—We have heard this morning of the fœtor and stench in the Deptford Cattle Market, whence all the men that are carrying the dirt and filth of the market on their boots can contaminate the whole country. There you have an indirect means of conveying contagion of foot-and-mouth disease.

6965. Then although you appear to deal with foot-and-mouth disease by stopping it at the port, yet from the want of restrictions, you allow it to spread by the indirect methods which you have suggested?—Want of restrictions, so far as foot-and-mouth disease is concerned, scarcely perhaps meets the case. Foot-and-mouth disease differs from every other foreign epizootic in the fact of its attacking all warm-blooded animals. I have known cases where the contagious character of foot-and-mouth disease has been far more marked, and its infectiousness has been far more manifest that even the infectiousness of cattle plague. In this way: it is possible by absolutely closing the entrance to a dairy or to a farm, to exclude rinderpest; but it is probably, not possible, to exclude foot-and-mouth disease, as a rat or a mouse passing up a drain into a dairy might be the means of introducing it. I am not at all stating that which is matter of theory; I am stating what is matter of fact, that an absolutely closed place may be the seat of contamination by foot-and-mouth poison, although under similar circumstances even rinderpest might be excluded.

6966. That being so, and the disease being so wonderfully subtle, would it ever be possible,

Chairman—continued.

with the amount of foot-and-mouth disease which we possess, absolutely to get rid of it?—Most certainly; and I wish to direct your attention to this. On Sunday last I happened to go down to Ramsgate, and I opened the "Thanet Advertiser," and the first paragraph under the local intelligence was: "Foot and Mouth Disease in Kent.—This disease has apparently, we are pleased to state, been entirely stamped out, not a single case having been reported to the county authorities during last week." Now, how has it been stamped out?—It has been stamped out simply because it is a self-exterminating disease. Foot-and-mouth disease will die out. Close the ports to-morrow morning, and you will save within 12 months a great deal more meat than the total value of the animals brought in.

6967. You think that closing the ports is the proper mode for stamping out the disease?—Certainly.

6968. But would it not require very stringent regulations to deal with the disease all through our country, because, though Kent is so fortunate, many other counties are not in that lucky position?—I am not here to state that we are not to exercise the most perfect vigilance; but I wish to bring out the facts of the case. As a matter of fact, the history of the disease everywhere proves that it is very much like a fire; it burns itself out; you may have some combustible matter remaining, and on lighting that again, you may have a renewed fire; but it is not the fact, at all events after practical observations extending over a period of 20 years, that the disease lurks in a place, and lights up again by itself, and from itself, without the fresh introduction of virus in some way or other.

6969. You think that in that way the virus of foot-and-mouth disease does not continue to be contagious?—It is probably the most perishable of all the contagia, though it is the most rapid in its communication.

6970. You believe that by proper restrictions being adopted in this country, it would be stamped out; and you suggest that, as we have not the power of enforcing the regulations in other countries, we must protect ourselves against their sending it back to us by stopping their export?—Clearly. I might be allowed, perhaps, to state, with regard to foot-and-mouth disease, that these contagia have always been for 200 years carefully observed as always travelling from east to west in the lines of communication established by war or trade. We certainly would not have foot-and-mouth disease either from Canada or from America. We contaminated America with pleuro-pneumonia, and might get pleuro-pneumonia from there; but the current of the new trade is rather directed in opposition to the introduction of foot-and-mouth disease.

6971. Would the same reasons that you have given for the stoppage of the import of foreign animals on account of foot-and-mouth disease equally apply with regard to pleuro-pneumonia?—Yes; but with pleuro-pneumonia the methods of isolation and extermination to be applied to the disease are of a very positive and definite character.

6872. It can be treated more like cattle plague?—Yes; but still it does not at all necessitate the general regulations which are so damaging to trade.

6973. You mean that the same universal regu-

Professor *Gamgee.*

22 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

lations would not be required for the purpose of stamping out pleuro-pneumonia as would be required for the purpose of dealing with the other disease?—Not under skilful management.

6974. But the danger of the introduction of the disease is greater, I suppose, in the case of pleuro-pneumonia than in the case of foot-and-mouth disease, from the fact of its lying latent in the animal for a longer period before it develops itself?—Yes. I proved in the first report which I communicated to the Government, that we have not only a latent stage, but latent cases; for I have so often seen animals apparently thriving from day to day and contaminating a dairy, having been purchased under conditions that would indicate that the disease was simply developing; and persons never saw that the animal was diseased until it was auscultated and brought under professional inspection.

6975. But from that danger, I suppose, you would lay greater stress upon the stoppage of import from abroad in consequence of the latent character of the disease?—Yes, certainly.

6976. And those restrictions would be confirmed by your wish to stamp out the cattle plague, which is equally liable to be brought over?—Clearly. The pecuniary losses by rinderpest in this and every other country where it is dealt with promptly are never equal to the pecuniary losses by foot-and-mouth disease or pleuro-pneumonia.

6977. You represent that with regard to cattle plague, however terrible it is, the losses are not so severe but that you might deal with it by proper restrictions?—Its very character compels people to stamp it out, and there is an end to the matter.

6978. And the danger of its introduction to other countries is so great to them that they would be more likely to take precautions that would render them free from it, and thus render their import here free from that disease?—Quite so, as is proved in the case of Germany, where they always protect themselves against Russian importation by establishing measures of great severity on the frontier. When first I anticipated the arrival of cattle plague from the Baltic, it was simply because Austria and Prussia and other Continental countries had such regulations on their frontiers as would practically protect us.

6979. I infer from what you have just said, that with regard to cattle plague you believe that the interest of foreign countries would tend to such regulations being established there as to make us tolerably secure from any re-introduction of it into this country; and that, if it were re-introduced, we should probably be able, with our own restrictive regulations, to stamp it out without the great loss that occurred in 1865?—Certainly.

6980. Therefore our dread, as agricultural people, of cattle plague, however terrible a disease it is, being imported from abroad is perhaps a little exaggerated?—I do not know whether the dread is exaggerated. It is certainly more properly dealt with than the other diseases.

6981. If we were dealing with cattle plague alone we might, in your opinion, by proper regulations, render ourselves tolerably secure against its introduction?—That is so, but it is not so with regard to foot-and-mouth disease; we are powerless with regard to that.

Chairman—continued.

6982. And you ground your idea that we ought to do away with the import from abroad, more upon the danger of the introduction of pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease, than upon the danger of the re-introduction of cattle plague?—I should say so.

6983. Your attention has naturally been directed to this American dead-meat trade?—It has. I may state that in 1865, having had rather painful experience of the difficulties in this country in securing such measures as would prevent contagion, I formed the opinion that by the conversion of the live-meat trade into a dead-meat trade, which demanded the preservation of meat, we might ultimately extinguish cattle diseases. It was that conviction that led me to devote myself, as I have done ever since, to these chemical, and physical, and engineering questions, which I may say have had some influence in bringing about the results that we have witnessed.

6984. Do you believe that those influences which are developing themselves with regard to this trade in America, as proving the possibility of bringing meat over, could be applied to the Continent?—Yes, and I believe that they might be applied to our home stock to a very large extent. The transport of live store cattle is an essential, but I wish not to be misunderstood upon this point. I believe that to save this country we must have for a period of say six months or 12 months at all events, to open the eyes of the country, if for nothing else, an absolute prohibition of live stock imports. The instant you accomplish that the whole of the Continent will do as they did in the cattle plague time, they will follow the Aberdonian plan and send you the meat dead.

6985. Can you tell the Committee the amount of import of dead meat that took place during the prohibition?—No, I have not the facts before me.

6986. From your last answer we might infer that a large trade in dead meat will come here in consequence of our stopping the live import?—As a matter of recollection, I can state that we had meat from Rotterdam and from Belgium. Discussions arose at the time as to slaughtering the animals at Mayence. Only the other day some Austrians came over with a view of seeing whether a quantity of meat might not be brought up from Vienna; and in 1865, the temporary restrictions upon the import of live animals led to considerable activity amongst men in devising means for the transport of dead meat.

6987. But even supposing that your view of it is correct, and that the foreign countries were prepared to send their dead meat here as soon as the live import was stopped, it must be some time before arrangements could be made with a view of carrying that out?—Not at all. At a cost of something like from 300 *l.* to 500 *l.*, within three weeks at any time an engineer would fit up a ship to carry dead meat.

6988. That was not quite what I meant by my question. What I meant was that the present trade being a live trade, if a dead trade had to be set up they would have to start the abattoirs and the whole system under which the slaughtering would take place there before the meat was sent over in the ship; would it not take some time before you changed the current of the trade into this fresh system?—Not if you closed the ports

Chairman—continued.

ports. Having the animals, say at Hamburg or Tonning, or elsewhere, to send across, you may rest quite assured that they will put up sheds, and slaughter them very promptly.

6989. As a matter of course that must follow, supposing that we were the only outlet for their trade; but supposing that for a time, at all events, they found Paris and Berlin better markets for the live animals than they had for the dead meat here, would it not practically drive that supply away from us for a time?—I hope it would. My own impression is that if we could return to the days when Dutch animals were being sent down to the Rhine Provinces, and the animals were not sent here alive, it would so largely contribute to the development of our meat resources that I think it would tend a great deal to our people being better fed. After a little delay the Americans would send us quite enough meat.

6990. I want to know how the gap would be bridged over between the cessation of the live, and the commencement of the dead supply?—There are 10,000,000 beeves now thriving in Texas; but, of course, from the northern portion of Illinois and Indiana, and the whole of Western America, we could obtain any quantity of meat.

6991. You believe that the want of supply to the towns could be filled by the American supply of dead meat; and therefore it turns entirely upon the question of whether the American system of shipping the meat has been brought to such a state of perfection as to enable us to rely on its being permanently brought over here in good condition?—The inference is not quite that. There is no doubt that the American supply will be sufficient for us with very slight modifications, and especially if we adopt in our own country rational means of preventing gluts, and preserving the meat; not doing as I see in London on the Pickford's vans, heaping up in mountains the quarters of beef which have been most carefully carried by the Americans to our ports, with men sleeping on the top of the meat, and with a vertical sun, when we have had days when the thermometer has been over 80 degrees in the shade, operating to injure the meat. With proper internal regulations depending upon ourselves we should soon meet, and meet I may state practically and immediately, any apparent inconvenience arising from the method that I suggest. I may state, of course, that if we have suffered as we have suffered so long, we might suffer a month longer, and give them due warning and let them prepare, if we are to look after the foreign interest more than we look after our own.

6992. In fact you really believe that the country could quite supply this demand after a given time, and that during that time the consumer would not suffer because of this new trade which has been introduced?—I am quite of that opinion.

6993. And you consider that the advantage to be gained is what you foresaw, namely, probable security to us at least, against the import of these diseases?—Certainly.

6994. Whilst you look to the restrictions which you believe ought to be in force in this country for rendering our home trade equally free from disease?—Quite so. It may strike honourable Members as singular that I should be

Chairman—continued.

be so strong upon one point. The restrictions which it is said that the farmer would dread, and would not sanction with regard to foot-and-mouth disease, are in my opinion useless. What I wish for is a trade such as there was in 1835, without a policeman at the cow's tail everywhere, and without the magistrates having to sign orders, with regard to the removal of stock from 10 o'clock in the morning until 10 o'clock at night. My belief is that we should return to the free liberty of the subject in our home cattle trade, and to a healthy stock, feeding our people as we fed them in the past.

6995. So far as your dealing with the foreign trade is concerned, you have altered your opinion a little. You stated that you were prepared to deal with the foreign trade rationally, so as to enable its growth in a proper way?—Do you think I intend to deal with it irrationally?

6996. You mean to stop it altogether now?—Except what we require in the shape of store stock. The foreign live stock trade is no red rag before my eyes. If you ask me whether we should be injured by the importation of Canadian stock alive, I should say no; I think that the Canadians are very stupid to send us the cattle alive, when they can send them so much cheaper and better dead; but, as a matter of fact, I have no objection to the transportation of a live bullock, except that it is commercially a very foolish process, and so far as the interests of our country are concerned, a most pernicious process.

6997. I gather that you would consider American and Canadian trade if it pays them, a safe trade even in live animals?—No, not from America, because the whole of the eastern towns are affected with pleuro-pneumonia since we contaminated them in 1847; but, so far as I know, Canada is healthy.

6998. That being the case, do you believe in what has been stated to the Committee as to the absolute immunity of Denmark, for instance, as a country, from pleuro-pneumonia?—Denmark has had three outbreaks of pleuro-pneumonia I think, within the past 10 or 15 years; I could not charge my memory absolutely, but it is a fact that Denmark, like many somewhat isolated countries, has been healthy. During the last century Denmark gave us cattle plague, perhaps more than any other country; because the instant a country like that is placed under favourable conditions by us, the cattle-dealers have a very keen scent for those channels through which cattle can be brought freely.

6999. But there was no introduction of live cattle at that time?—I beg your pardon. Modern history on these subjects resolves itself into this: From 1714 to 1770 we imported live cattle and cattle plague, and I may state that British authority and British science taught us clearly then how to deal with these diseases. Layard, Cullen, Mortimer and others, had sufficient power with the Government and with the king to stop imports in 1770. The cattle of the country had been so destroyed that it took 30 years to bring it up to its proper point; but as we approached the present century, the animals were absolutely healthy, and we had a progressive increase in the supply of animal food; from having a population of about 11,000,000 in 1801, we jumped to a population of something like 19,000,000 in 1840; and

Professor *Gamgee.*

22 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

the British farmer fed our people, and prices went down from 5 *s.* 8 *d.* per stone to something like 3 *s.* 8 *d.* per stone for beef. Then we had, about 1839, first, the smuggling of Dutch cattle into Cork, which led to pleuro-pneumonia reaching Ireland, and foot-and-mouth disease came into different parts of the country owing to the free-trade movement; and since the importation of cattle, we have had exactly the same history as we had during the past century, namely, progressive development of disease, and attendant scarcity of animal food. We have, therefore, the three periods: from 1714 to 1770, disease and scarcity; from 1770 to 1840, progressive increase in the amount of animal food, and prosperity among our cattle producers; and from 1840 to the present time a devastation that I consider a disgrace to us after all our experience of the past century.

7000. We were speaking of the Denmark supply, and I understood you to say that we had imported cattle plague from Denmark?—We imported the cattle plague from Denmark about 100 years ago, not once but repeatedly, and also from the Low Countries.

7001. After you had stated to us that, on account of their being no pleuro-pneumonia or any of those diseases in Canada, you did not think that there was any necessity for stopping the import of live animals, if they thought that commercially it was profitable from that country, I then asked you whether that would not apply to Denmark, where certainly, since the beginning of this century, they have not had cattle plague, and where, although pleuro-pneumonia has broken out on three occasions, it has, according to the Danish evidence, always been limited to the farm on which it broke out, and no instance can be quoted of the introduction of the disease from that country?—The same may be said with regard to Norway, because it is beyond the centre of traffic; but the instant that you deal with any country to our east, as it might be proposed to be dealt with Denmark, that instant you would find that the German cattle trade would come straight through Denmark, and flood us with disease again.

7002. I understand you to say that, whilst you would allow the Canadian import, you think that Denmark and Sweden, happening to be to the east, ought to be prohibited, because of the possibility of their being made the means of conveying the disease to us from other countries?—Quite so.

7003. But you have said that you would not allow the import of American cattle on account of the pleuro-pneumonia, which we introduced there; would not the same thing apply to Canada as applies to Denmark, because the trader in America would naturally throw his animal into Canada as the German would throw his into Denmark?—At first sight you might think so; but the fact is that the importation from Canada is more through America than the importation from America is through Canada. It would not pay to ship animals from the eastern towns in America that are afflicted through Canada, and I think that the conditions of the trade are not such as to lead to any importation of disease through Canada. I wish it to be distinctly understood that, in order to accomplish what we want, the best thing is to begin and treat everybody alike, feed our people, and abolish live stock imports.

Chairman—continued.

7004. You would not even make the exception in favour of Canada to carry out your principle?—I simply stated that I did not wish it to be supposed that I was prejudiced. I want, so far as the lights of science and truth will go, to act up to what we require. I have no prejudice and no vested interests to affect the matter at all. All I want is to save this country, and, in fact, ultimately other countries, from the losses which have been sustained.

7005. From your science and knowledge, do you think that is the only way of securing ourselves against disease?—Yes; by grappling with it firmly.

7006. You suggest, with regard to the introduction of stores into this country, that they should be dealt with by quarantine?—I think that it would be a great hardship if a breeder in this country wanted to have some short-horn bulls, say from Kentucky, that he should not be allowed to import them. I believe that we should interfere as little as possible with the liberty of the subject where it in no way injures us.

7007. I understood you to say, with regard to the store cattle, that, for the reasons which you have given, you think that they ought not to be dealt with by prohibition, but by quarantine?—Certainly; we can only deal with them by quarantine. I have a great dislike to quarantine, as a rule. I know the great and serious objections to it. At the same time I see no other way of dealing with the matter.

7008. But that would leave a large door open, would it not, for the introduction of disease by those store animals?—It would, especially in relation to the supply of large towns with cows; and I think that if there were a little more discretion in the way which our dairymen, especially in the metropolis, conduct their business, they might probably save themselves by co-operative means; and I think you will find, through the chairman of the Metropolitan Association of Dairymen, that they would willingly submit to some means by which for a time they were either supplied entirely from our own country, or under very stringent regulations from either Holland or Oldenburg, or other places where they can get cheap cows, so as to exterminate pleuro-pneumonia. I think their co-operation has never been sought in the right way; but the way in which we have over 50 per cent. of the animals kept in our large towns dying from lung disease is a disgrace to the country.

7009. I suppose that you are quite alive to the danger that quarantine carries in its train?—Quite so. I am very sorry that we have to make any kind of deviation from the ordinary course.

7010. With quarantine you have all the difficulty of separating all the animals and so forth, and the danger of an animal becoming infected from the very fact of its being quarantined?—No doubt it is a very difficult thing.

7011. Yet you think that, notwithstanding all this danger with regard to quarantine, store cattle ought to be admitted under certain regulations?—I think that probably restrictions would be so oppressive as only to lead to import under very urgent circumstances, such as the import of animals for breeding purposes, or possibly

Chairman—continued.

sibly under some well-defined regulations for the supply of some of our large towns with milch cows.

7012. With regard to the dairies of the towns have you, since you gave your former evidence, paid much attention to them?—No, I cannot say that I have; I have been constantly gleaning what facts I could, but I have not visited the dairies to any extent.

7013. Do you feel that they are what has been described, viz., places where disease is very liable to appear, and from which it is very liable to spread?—Certainly, because all the town dairies are maintained by weekly purchases of fresh animals, especially since the spread of these diseases. In Copenhagen, perhaps, the cows are kept worse than they are in any other country. I am not stating this from my personal knowledge, but from facts that have been communicated to me. The country is beyond the reach of foot-and-mouth disease and those maladies, and the animals are always sound, proving that there is nothing in the town dairy calculated to engender those diseases, but it is the repeated and constant purchases of diseased animals. Personally, I have grown to believe that we ought to abolish town dairies and have them all in the suburbs; and, I think, the towns of England are getting alive to that.

7014. The carrying of milk from the country into towns is a trade that is very largely increasing at the present moment, is it not?—Yes. One observation that I made when I was specially working at the subject in connection with dairies was, that the poor people had certainly been supplied very much worse with milk since the importation of these diseases than they used to be; that is to say, that children in the large towns had a great deal more milk available years ago than they have had since.

7015. Is that in proportion to the population having grown in the large towns since that time?—I made some remarks specially with regard to Dublin. I know that in Dublin, through medical authorities, and through inquiries that I made amongst the people, that from 1840 to 1862, when I was making some special inquiries, the amout of milk available for the poor had greatly diminished, and the price had gone up.

7016. You attribute that to the introduction of diseases into dairies?—Yes.

7017. Do you suggest that dairies should be entirely prevented from being kept in towns, or do you think that the evil could be met by strict and proper regulations?—To a certain extent it might be met by strict and proper regulations, but I am strongly in favour of converting the town dairy system, if possible, into a suburban dairy system, and the local authorities, I hope and believe, are taking the matter up.

7018. But at the same time you think you could get the security that you desire by proper regulations?—I think so.

7019. And those regulations would be combined with your quarantining of the foreign cows?—Yes, if they were required, but they would not be required very long; our farmers would breed quite enough cows for them directly.

7020. Is there any other point that you would like to mention to the Committee in your examination-in-chief?—I should like to make a few

Chairman—continued.

remarks in connection with the dead-meat trade, as to the preservation of meat. Since 1865 I have been hard at work upon that subject, and at immense cost I have conducted an extensive series of experiments. In 1869, in America, in Texas, I first found that the preservation of fresh meat without the abstraction of animal heat was impossible, just in the same way as from olden time to the present it has been found impossible to salt meat unless it were properly set and cooled. I found that no method of meat preservation by which we require to keep the meat fresh could be successful without either abstracting the animal heat, or so elevating the temperature, as in the tinned meat process, to destroy all germs of decay. It was in Texas that I first used blowers with proper motive-power, driving the air out of the chamber, passing it over ice, cooling the meat, and performing the self-same operation that has since developed the American trade. My experiments were made known at that time, and under various patents the system has been carried on. The defect of the present system rests upon this: that as we approach 32 degrees of cold the air contains a larger amount of moisture, and almost all methods of fresh meat preservation depend more upon drying than upon temperature. In olden times and in barbarous countries people dried their meat by placing it in honey; the process of salting is purely a method of desiccation; and I found that by placing meat or vegetable products in a current of cold air you could obtain such a degree of desiccation as would practically keep the meat for many months without freezing it. My difficulty in Texas arose from the fact that ice was very dear there, and in New York meat was very dear; so that the reason that the trade has been developed lately, has been that the price of meat has come to so low a point, that where ice was not at a prohibitory price, they could obtain this cool current of air which we know to be sufficient for the transportation of meat. In the year 1873, I published a pamphlet on this fresh meat transport, which perhaps, I may be permitted to hand in, as in it there are certain facts with regard to this dry cold air process which will be explained.

7021. You quote these, I suppose, as bearing upon the present American import to show that it is in its infancy, and that it is almost certain that by proper application of the system of cold air, you will get over the difficulties which have been shown to exist as to the dampness?—Yes, they are using now say, 30 tons of ice for every 100 tons of meat to carry; and one ton and a half of coal burnt will produce those 30 tons of ice.

7022. In fact, that is only working out what you stated to the Committee of 1873, as your foreshadowing of what was coming?—Yes, no doubt.

Mr. *W. E. Forster.*

7023. I gather from your evidence that, with one exception, you take the same view now as you did in 1873; in 1873 I had the pleasure of seeing you, and I asked you whether you looked forward to a minimum of interference with the home trade and a rational interference with the foreign trade, and you replied in the affirmative; and you defined that rational interference with the foreign trade to be slaughter of fat animals at the port of landing, and quarantining of store

Professor *Gamgee.*

22 June 1877.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

animals; I think the change that you make is, that now you would not allow any animals to be landed alive except the animals that are to go into quarantine?—Owing especially to the recent experience with regard to the way in which animals slaughtered even at Deptford can communicate cattle plague throughout the country.

7024. You adhere to the opinion that that there should be a minimum of interference with the home trade, and a rational interference with the foreign trade?—Certainly.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

7025. In fact, your opinion is, that if we prohibited the import of live animals, foot-and-mouth disease would disappear?—Yes.

7026. You have travelled a good deal upon the Continent, I suppose?—I have.

7027. Do you believe that there is much more foot-and-mouth disease, say, in Denmark at this moment, than there is in England?—I have not been to Denmark lately.

Monday, 25th June 1877.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Major Allen.
Mr. Anderson.
Mr. Assheton.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. Chaplin.
Mr. James Corry.
Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.
Mr. W. E. Forster.
Mr. French.
Sir George Jenkinson.
Colonel Kingscote.
Mr. M'Lagan.
Sir Rainald Knightley.
Mr. Mundella.
Mr. Murphy.
Mr. Arthur Peel.
Mr. Ritchie.
Sir Henry Selwin Ibbetson.
Mr. Torr.

SIR HENRY SELWIN IBBETSON, BART., IN THE CHAIR.

Professor JOHN GAMGEE, re-called; and further Examined.

Professor *Gamgee.*

25 June 1877.

Mr. *W. E. Forster.*

7028. I THINK my last question was whether you had been in Denmark?—I have been in Schleswig-Holstein.

7029. From your opportunity of seeing the state of the cattle in Schleswig-Holstein, and the state of the cattle in England, do you consider that there was more disease at the time when you were in Schleswig-Holstein than in England?—As to relative quantity, I am not aware whether there was or there was not. Schleswig-Holstein is more difficult to keep clear than our own islands.

7030. I am not asking you which might be kept the most clear if certain preventive measures were taken, but whether you think that at this time, or at any time within your experience, the actual relative amount of disease has been greater in Schleswig-Holstein than in England?—I have no doubt that at times the disease has been more rife in Schleswig-Holstein, and at other times it has been more rife in this country.

7031. When do you think it was more rife in Schleswig-Holstein than in England?—I cannot define any particular period. When I went to Hamburg in 1863, and first organised the international veterinary congresses, a considerable amount of disease had been raging in Schleswig-Holstein.

7032. What disease?—Pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease; the transit diseases or international diseases.

7033. I understand you now to propose that all importation of live cattle from the Continent to England should be prohibited, and that there should not be any great amount of restriction upon the home cattle?—If we desire free trade in meat that is an essential.

7034. Am I right in supposing that your proposal is to stop the import of live cattle into England?—Certainly.

7035. And at the same time not to have any great amount of restriction upon the home cattle?—Certainly; I wish to return to the position of and before 1839.

7036. In fact, your policy is to keep the foreign cattle out, and to let the home cattle go free?—My own impression is, that the farmers in their own interest will develop the dead meat trade at home as well as abroad, so far as it can be developed.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

7037. That being your proposal, I wish to ask you whether you have any reason to suppose that foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia are more rife in the countries from which you would prohibit the import than they are in these islands; for example, do you think that those diseases are more rife in Spain and Portugal?—Certainly not; I should say that in Spain and Portugal disease is generally not so rife, and were it not for the cattle imported into Spain, Spain would be quite as healthy as our own country.

7038. Do you not think that at the present moment Spain is more healthy than our own country?—I should think it is, from its position in the extreme south-west of Europe.

7039. And yet you would stop the trade in Spanish live cattle?—Most assuredly.

7040. I understood you to state that, when the cattle plague raged in England in 1865 and 1866, the dead meat import took the place of the live cattle import?—To a certain extent it did; but there were no means of developing it to its full extent. The restrictions on trade were such as to stop everything for a time; but I understood at the time that meat was being brought in from Rotterdam and elsewhere; in fact, I was called to a case of cattle plague near Windsor, where I was informed that cattle plague had been imported by carcases direct from Rotterdam; Rotterdam at that moment being very infective.

7041. That being your opinion, I should like to know how you explain these official returns. It appears that, in 1863, the import of salted or fresh beef, that is of dead beef, was 287,000 cwt., and in 1864, it was 334,000 cwt.; whereas in 1865, 1866, and 1867, in each of which years there was cattle plague, the import was considerably less, being 244,000 cwt. in the first of those years, 232,000 cwt. in the next, and in the third, 246,000 cwt. It appears also, that in those years cattle were not prohibited; in fact, the

Professor *Gamgee.* 25 June 1877.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

import of live cattle in 1865 was 283,000, being 50,000 more than it was in 1864; and in 1866, it was 237,000, being 6,000 more than in 1864. So that the real fact of the matter was that, instead of the dead meat taking the place of the live cattle, there were more live cattle imported, and there was less dead meat imported during those years than in the previous years. You were not aware of those returns?—I am aware in general figures of the returns. My statement amounts to this: that when from certain ports the importation of live cattle was stopped (and I suppose that nobody will doubt that the importation in 1865 or 1866 was stopped from certain parts) from those ports meat was imported, for I saw it. To what extent it was imported I am not prepared to state. But I am of opinion that if the import of live animals was stopped the foreigners would soon find their way if it only paid them, notwithstanding the inferior condition of their cattle, to send them here dead.

7042. I think you must acknowledge that if these returns are correct, there is no proof gained by the experience of those years; because taking the whole country together, as of course we must do, it was not the case that the dead meat filled up the gap caused by the stoppage of the import of live cattle?—I never pretended that it did.

7043. You made use of an expression in your evidence, which I did not quite catch, about the number of animals in London that died of pleuro-pneumonia; I understood you to say that 50 per cent. of the animals died of that disease?—I published, in 1865, very careful statistics; and I have no reason to alter the figures which I then obtained. As far back as 15 years ago, I think, I determined that, for every hundred animals that die of disease in this country, from 70 to 75 per cent. die of imported disease, of international contagion; and 25 per cent. die from all other causes put together, accidents, such as broken bones, and local injury and disease.

7044. What diseases do you include in the expression, "Imported disease or international contagion"?—The bulk of the mortality is really due to pleuro-pneumonia in connection with our large towns. The deaths from pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease combined, will make up 70 per cent. of the total number of deaths; and if the Veterinary Department of the Privy Council collected all the evidence that men like myself could handle on this point, I should be able to give you positive facts upon this subject.

7045. Do you imagine that any man who keeps a herd of cattle, may naturally expect that 70 per cent. of the deaths among his cattle from natural causes will be from pleuro-pneumonia or foot-and-mouth disease?—Permit me to state that when I speak of the total number of animals that die in this country, I do not refer to the loss being 70 per cent. on any single stock, although it may be so in the case of pleuro-pneumonia in a town dairy. Taking a town dairy, the least annual mortality from pleuro-pneumonia, when I last took extensive statistics on this subject, was 54½ per cent.

7046. Do you confine your statement to London?—I do not. The average mortality over the country since the importation of foreign diseases for some years was this: 5 per cent. for Scotland, 6 per cent. for England, and 7 per cent. for Ireland. For two or three years after the first importation of live animals farmers knew not what to do, and they proposed that they should have insurance companies, and try to gauge what the mortality would be. They thought that the losses would be covered by one, or two, or three per cent., but they found that that was not the case, and that the imported diseases abounded to such an extent that whatever premiums they charged they had to go into liquidation.

7047. But I think I understood you to state that you believed (and no doubt you have reasons for so believing) that 70 per cent. of the mortality among animals in Great Britain is owing to diseases of originally imported contagion, which apply mainly to pleuro-pneumonia?—Certainly.

7048. Then surely, if that is the average mortality, any man who keeps a herd must lay his account with this: that of the animals which he keeps that will die of disease, 70 per cent. will probably die of pleuro-pneumonia?—Seventy per cent. will die of pleuro-pneumonia, and in a town dairy probably more than that; and I wish to state this; that if in any town like London proper regulations were made to dissect all the animals that die of disease, you would find that I was not very far out. I think you are going to have a veterinary surgeon from Newcastle-on-Tyne, and if you will examine him upon this point, I believe that he has for some years with great zeal followed up the system of examining diseased animals, and you will find that I am not very far out.

7049. That of course would mean that, with the exception of animals intended for slaughter (which is a great exception), taking the dairy farm, you consider that the mortality is very much greater than it used to be?—The mortality since the importation of live stock is of course very much greater.

7050. Have you any facts that you could give in proof of that?—The whole history of cattle insurance institutions in this country demonstrates it. I gave the history in my report to the Privy Council in 1862, when I first determined and explained positively that the maladies destroying our stock were pure contagia. I then pointed out that after the importation of live stock those insurance companies were formed, and from the books of those insurance companies I determined what was the original estimate of the losses, and what afterwards turned out to be those losses.

7051. Such a statement as that shows your conviction that pleuro-pneumonia is exceedingly rife in Great Britain?—I think that possibly it is much less prevalent now, especially in a number of counties. The other day I was told that in Ireland they are very much better off than they were, and I am told that they are better in Cheshire than they were, because of course cattle disease legislation has done some good.

7052. Surely you cannot make the statement that you think that 70 per cent. of the mortality is owing to pleuro-pneumonia, without accompanying it with your conviction that it is very rife indeed in the island?—We have the healthiest country in the world, and the mortality ought to be very small.

7053. If we have the healthiest country in the world, I should have thought it very extraordinary that 70 per cent. of the mortality should be from pleuro-pneumonia?—The healthier the animals

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

animals the more rapidly they are destroyed by contagion very often.

7054. When you talk of contagion, do you mean pleuro-pneumonia?—Certainly; when I talk of contagion I mean pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease.

7055. Then, am I wrong in supposing that you think that pleuro-pneumonia is very rife in this country at this moment?—In the large towns it is very rife, but in the country districts it is possibly less rife than it has been.

7056. That being your opinion, I understand that your mode of stopping pleuro-pneumonia would be, practically, to order the animals from abroad to be killed and to let the home animals alone?—I never stated that at all; what I stated was this: that we should adopt for a time proper repressive measures; there is only one disease that I know of that is self-exterminating, and that is foot-and-mouth disease and that is a malady which causes more money loss, though not a greater loss by deaths than any other disease.

7057. But I understood you, at the beginning of your examination to-day, to state that, practically, you would not advise much restriction for the home animals?—I aim at having absolute freedom of trade in our own country; I should aim at having no restrictions at all in the long run; but that is a totally different thing from the question whether I am to cure a diseased animal or prevent a contagious disease by rational means; the first thing that is to be done is certainly to clear the country of pleuro-pneumonia by isolation and other preventive measures, but it ought not to take a skilful man six months to do it.

7058. You made allusion to the Texas cattle in your examination in chief, and you spoke of there being 10,000,000 cattle in Texas; upon what do you base that opinion?—I used that in round figures. I believe that the last time that I was in Texas, in 1869, they had between 5,000,000 and 6,000,000 beeves; they have been increasing immensely, and the area of country where the cattle rearing exists is extending very largely. I have not before me statistics from the United States to assist me, but in round figures I know that there must be certainly very close on to 10,000,000 head of cattle in Texas.

7059. Do you know what is the amount of cattle in Great Britain according to the last return?—I have a most wretched memory for numbers, but I think it is somewhere about 10,000,000. I have not the statistics before me. They have nearly three times the number in the United States, and we ought to have as many head as they have. I think that they have about 26,000,000 head of cattle in the United States.

7060. Are you aware that, according to the last return for 1876, the total number of cattle in Great Britain is under 6,000,000?—But that does not include Ireland. Of course I look upon our own three islands as one for all purposes of legislation and trade.

7060*. You do not think that it would be at all an unreasonable supposition that there are 4,000,000 more cattle in Texas than there are in Great Britain?—I do not think it at all unreasonable.

Mr. *Assheton.*

7061. I think I understood your view of the averages to be this: that on an average five per cent. of the cattle in England die of mortality?—

Mr. *Assheton*—continued.

By everything, including the foreign contagia or cattle disease. Prior to 1840 I do not believe that the average in this country would be more than 1 to 1¼ or 1½ per cent.

7062. Do you include accidents in that percentage?—Accidents and everything.

7063. Of those five cattle in a hundred which you say die from disease, I think you say that, roughly speaking, about 4, or 70 per cent., die of foreign disease?—Certainly.

7064. Then I presume you argue from that, that if by some good fortune we could be entirely rid of foreign disease we should save four beasts in 100; is that your contention?—Certainly; I think it is really trifling with the matter not to put a stop to it.

Mr. *Jacob Bright.*

7065. With regard to the mortality from lung disease, did I correctly understand that you gave us figures merely as your own opinion, or that you have actual facts which confirm that opinion?—I have facts. I had facts when I was working specially at the subject which have been confirmed repeatedly by independent inquirers.

7066. How were those facts obtained?—By house-to-house visitation, and getting the facts from the individual dairymen; and from the Metropolitan Dairy Association here I have no doubt that you will get the same facts if they have obtained the evidence.

7067. Over what area did you get those facts?—Over almost every town in the United Kingdom; mainly in London, in Edinburgh, and in Dublin.

7068. You spoke of the mortality of cattle in large towns, and I understood you to say that 50 per cent. of the cattle in the large towns died; did I understand you rightly?—I think it was 54½ per cent.

7069. What sort of cattle were those?—Cows.

7070. Milch cows?—Yes. The Lancashire communicated disease to their calves, and shipped it over to Ireland, and brought us back more pleuro-pneumonia; and they continue to do so to the present day. It was pleuro-pneumonia from Rochdale and many of those Lancashire towns that destroyed our short-horned stock in Cumberland and other districts. That mass of pleuro-pneumonia is no doubt being shipped back at the present day by the calves which are brought into those dairies.

7071. You speak of Rochdale; I suppose you know the circumstances of many of those towns?—I have been through most of the Lancashire towns; I have been a great deal in Manchester, but I do not think I was ever in Rochdale.

7072. Do you mean to say that one-half of the milch cows in Manchester die of disease?—During the greater number of years since 1842, I have very little doubt that that has been the average mortality.

7073. Year by year you think that one-half of the cows die of disease?—Year by year, unless some special provision has been made quite lately.

7074. You spoke of the total mortality of the three kingdoms, and I think you said that in England 5 per cent. of the animals die, and in Scotland 6 per cent., and in Ireland 7 per cent.?—Yes. Allow me to state that that was from insurance statistics, taking the animals over a wide area which have been insured and paid for.

Professor *Gamgee.*

25 June 1877.

Mr. *Jacob Bright*—continued.

7075. You have spoken a great deal about international disease; which of these three kingdoms is most subject to contact with international disease; England, Ireland, or Scotland?—England, certainly; but then in England a vast number of animals are slaughtered at the ports, and the conditions which favour the propagation of the disease when once it is in the country prevail differently at different seasons of the year. For example, the Ballinasloe fair may contaminate an enormous area of country, just as the Allhallows fair first propagated disease in Scotland. I proved to the Government, in 1862, that in England the contagious diseases were communicated by Scotch and Irish cattle; in Scotland by English and Irish cattle; and that in Ireland the disease was conveyed by Scotch cattle brought to Belfast, and English calves and cattle *viâ* Liverpool and other parts. So that it is a question of the distance over which the animals have to travel; the farther they travel the greater the number of centres in which they are likely to take contagion, and the greater the chances of their propagating disease.

7076. Still, you admit that Ireland has very much less connection with the Continent than England has, so far as cattle plague is concerned?—Certainly.

7077. And therefore one would suppose that the international contagion should affect Ireland very much less than it affects England?—It so happens that Ireland was first infected in the south by direct importation from Holland.

7078. But you would suppose, would you not, that continuously England should be much more infected than Ireland?—Given that you exterminate the diseases, then no doubt the difficulty of contaminating Ireland is greater. Ireland has not had cattle plague this year, and Ireland had little cattle plague in 1865-66.

7079. Then Ireland is very much less in connection with the Continent than England is, so far as the cattle trade, or so far as these international diseases, as you call them, are concerned, and yet the mortality in Ireland is something like 50 per cent. more than it is in England?—Yes, but I can explain that; for example, in the county of Meath, where a very large number of animals are purchased for the purpose of breeding, they are bought in the Dublin market; and the animals that were insured were not the animals of the mountains of Roscommon and Kerry, and elsewhere, where they were healthy, but they were animals which were in the contaminating markets, or in close contact with them. That is why in the large towns the cows are so destroyed, because week by week they are buying in fresh animals. It is interesting to know that you can divide England under three heads: the hills that are absolutely healthy, where even foot-and-mouth disease is rarely seen; the vales where they have mainly cows, and which are every now and then contaminated, but where they do not breed disease; and then the large towns, which are the pest centres.

7080. You tell us that, if we excluded foreign cattle foot-and-mouth disease would suddenly, or, as I understood you, very rapidly die out absolutely in the three kingdoms?—Certainly. You might have some cases of mediate contagion, indirect bearing of the disease; but it is so easily isolated as to open the eyes of everybody to the truth.

Mr. *Jacob Bright*—continued.

7081. Do you know the condition of things in Holland?—I was in Holland in 1862, but I have not been there since.

7082. It is not permitted to import cattle into Holland, is it?—It may not be now; and prior to the great cattle trade from east to west, established through Europe as far back as 1833, Holland was as healthy as our own island. In 1833, I believe Holland was infected, but it was specially infected when the distillers of Schiedam and the neighbourhood of Rotterdam, and other places, were feeding bullocks for our own market; and then also Friesland became infected.

7083. But how did Holland become infected if she did not import cattle?—She did import cattle when she became infected; and you will find, in some of the pigeon-holes in the Privy Council Office, my maps upon the invasion of Holland at that time.

7084. Does Holland import cattle now?—I am not personally aware of the rules, but I believe not.

7085. Is there any foot-and-mouth disease now in Holland?—I do not know; but whether or not, I should certainly stop the import of live animals; at all events, from all Continental ports, as a free trade measure.

7086. You would exclude foreign cattle, but you would not have regulations or restrictions with regard to the movement of English cattle?—I certainly would; with regard to pleuro-pneumonia, I would effectually prevent it, and I would always isolate whenever there were contagious diseases; but the necessity for such restriction would pass; we should have no such disease.

7087. With regard to foot-and-mouth disease, you would have no such restriction; it would die out suddenly of itself, you think?—You are quite right; I do not say that it would die out suddenly, but promptly.

7088. You are aware, I daresay, that men who can speak with quite as much authority as yourself have expressed quite an opposite view before this Committee?—I know that the gentlemen who you state have quite as much authority as myself in the matter have been the advocates from the very first of everything that has been contrary to that which I advise; and, if the history of my counsel and the history of their counsel be taken, I am quite willing to abide by the result.

7089. I speak of our first witness, Professor Brown?—I do not consider Professor Brown an authority on contagious cattle diseases.

7090. Did he not tell us very positively that it would be absurd to add to the restrictions on imports unless we also placed similar restrictions with regard to home cattle both in reference to foot-and-mouth disease and in reference to lung disease?—Yes, I believe he said something of the sort. I trust you will believe that I wish to be respectful to everybody; but it is a matter of vast importance as to the views that ought to prevail in this land of ours, and I believe it will be found that during 25 years I have never erred, and I challenge anybody to state one instance where, if they had followed my advice, they would not have been, at all events, four or five years in advance of what they were.

7091. You consider that we shall never be in a proper position until we absolutely exclude foreign

Mr. *Jacob Bright*—continued.

foreign live cattle?—Until then we shall never have free trade in meat and a sound development of our own meat production.

7092. You think that we shall never have free trade until we exclude all foreign trade?—I beg your pardon, until we so regulate foreign trade that it is not liable to the irregular stoppages, to the mismanagement, and to the vicious systems that have prevailed during the past 20 years.

7093. Still, if you could, you would shut out the live cattle from abroad?—I would shut out the live cattle from abroad, certainly.

7094. And you would trust to the dead meat and to the growth of English cattle?—Clearly. It is cheaper to have the dead meat, and it is safer to have the dead meat.

7095. What do you say about the dead meat in July and August?—Since I was before the Committee the other day, I have taken great care to satisfy myself upon one point; and, with the co-operation of one single railway company, (and I have no doubt that all the others would be quite as active), I could provide cold storage for the whole dead-meat trade of America within a period of from one month to six weeks.

7096. But is the dead-meat trade a successful one in the hot months?—Certainly not under existing conditions.

7097. Not anywhere?—I cannot say not anywhere, because the American meat is coming in steadily and realising exceedingly good prices in good times; but unfortunately the American consignors ship their meat over here, and the moment it is landed, all the admirable conditions that they have imposed for its transportation are abolished.

7098. Would you shut out live cattle before the dead meat had been generally and properly organised?—I would shut them out to-morrow morning.

7099. Assuming, then, that you shut them out to-morrow morning, what would be the condition of this country with regard to its meat supply for the next month or two?—We should not feel it at all; I do not believe that it would affect the price one farthing per pound; it would not bring it up to the price that it was before the importation of American dead meat. That is my belief.

7100. You do not think the exclusion of a considerable source of supply affects price at all?—Yes, provided there is not a very great facility to make good the deficiency. The telegraph will bring within 14 days four cargoes for one from New York.

7101. How is it that we do not get more now from America than we do?—I can explain it from Manchester experience. The co-operative society in Manchester that supplies the meat stores throughout Lancashire and Yorkshire, took about 300 to 350 quarters per week during the cold weather; they have been compelled to drop to something like 50 or 60 quarters per week, because the conditions under which it was landed rendered it impossible to get that meat to the hands of the working people in sound condition. If they had, as I state, cold meat stores in Manchester, and the meat trade were turned into a trade in an imperishable and not a perishable product the whole difficulty would vanish.

7102. If we had the proper conditions we should get the supply?—Any quantity.

7103. But you would shut out foreign cattle even though we have not the proper conditions?—The proper conditions would follow instantly.

Mr. *Jacob Bright*—continued.

7104. You spoke of the great prosperity of the farmer up to the year 1840, because he had no trouble as to international diseases?—As a stock raiser and meat producer he was prosperous.

7105. He was a prosperous man at that time, was he?—We had a vast number of people profitably producing meat for our markets, although the price of meat went down.

7106. I understood you to say that, as compared with the present, the farmer was then a prosperous man?—I suppose that the amount of capital that has been brought into farming during the last 30 years has completely altered the conditions of farming. I am not prepared to stand a cross-examination upon that point, but I am prepared to state this: that the farmer could afford to sell his meat progressively cheaper, notwithstanding the increase in population, from 1800 to 1840, with an occasional exception.

7107. Up to the year 1840, was he not coming to the House of Commons every few years complaining of the grievous condition in which he lived?—Certainly he was. The great advantages of free trade have naturally tended materially to diminish the chances, and if we have free trade in meat now his position would be improved.

Mr. *Mundella.*

7108. I gather from your statement that you believe that foot-and-mouth disease is generated, and exclusively generated, abroad, and not at home?—Foot-and-mouth disease belongs to a very limited group of maladies which are only known to us as propagated from the sick to the healthy, and which have invariably originated from the east for about 200 or 300 years.

7109. But you are aware that Holland has prohibited the importation of cattle for some years, and yet disease is chronic there?—All the continental states have very great difficulty in preventing what we call mediate or indirect contagion.

7110. Why should England expect to fare better than Holland in that respect?—Because we have an ocean around us; we have a barrier against all diseases provided we treat our animals rationally.

7111. You assume, then, that it is possible to exterminate disease in England, and that it would not revive if all foreign cattle were excluded?—Certainly, it would not.

7112. And you say that you would shut out foreign cattle to-morrow morning, and you believe that, in the result, meat would not be one farthing per pound dearer?—I do.

7113. You are aware of the immense importation of foreign cattle into this country?—I am.

7114. You believe that the immediate withdrawal of an enormous proportion of our supply would not affect the price of meat?—Not disastrously at all; not like the cattle diseases affect the price of meat.

7115. Is it not contrary to all experience and to all political economy to suppose that price would not be raised if you withdrew an immense supply; for instance, we have heard of 100,000 sheep being brought to market in one day, and, if you withdrew that supply, do you mean to say that in the result meat would be no dearer?—If you

Professor *Gamgee.*

25 June 1877.

Mr. *Mundella*—continued.

abolished live stock imports, those animals would come dead; it may take a month to regulate the trade, but, if you apprehend famine, my opinion is that there would be no famine in the land.

7116. But surely it is the interest of the cattle exporters from foreign countries to bring meat in the shape in which it will pay them the best, and which will secure to them the most regular market, is it not?—Their statement now is that, from the cattle of the Continent being much inferior to the American cattle, they could not stand side by side in the meat market if they brought them in dead; that is a deliberate statement made by persons who have purchased of late the right to use the patented processes as adopted in the American trade.

7117. We import a great many cattle from Tonning, for instance, which is a very small town; how do you suppose that all those cattle would be killed at the port of exportation, and that they would be brought to this market?—Just as it is done in America; the animals are brought in twos and threes and tens and twenties by the consignors and shipped across; the whole of this trade is in the hands of capitalists, and it is a very small matter for them to knock up a slaughter-house and send the meat dead; each boat only costs 200 *l.* to prepare it for the trade.

7118. That would be a withdrawal from the English market of all that is known as offal, would it not?—Not so. A great portion of the offal, if it is prepared in the same way as the meat, comes perfectly well, except the manure, and I do not suppose that you would hold out for the feculent matter.

7119. You said, did you not, that the American meat was already realising good prices in good times?—Exceedingly good prices.

7120. Are you aware that we had a witness before us last Monday who told us that the American meat, which came to market in one steamer a week or two ago realised 7 *d.* per pound the first day, 4 *d.* per pound the second day, 2 *d.* per pound the third day, and that the rest was destroyed?—That shows how important it is for us to regulate the trade properly. If that meat had been properly protected, and we had not gluts in the market, with the deterioration and slimy condition due to improper management here, that would not have occurred.

7121. You think that it is possible to continue the conditions of importation so securely that the meat will arrive here in good condition, so that it can be sent to all the distant markets of England in good condition, and distributed throughout the country without any deterioration or loss?—Certainly.

7122. And that the exporter can rely on his article coming to a regular steady market?—Certainly; and the salvation of our large towns and our large manufacturing districts rests upon the cold-meat store system.

7123. How would you propose to store large quantities of meat that have been 10, or 11, or 12, or 14 days at sea?—There is no difficulty at all; you can just put it on a truck.

7124. I will take Liverpool, for instance?—You would put it on a truck in Liverpool, and the transit to the metropolis is certainly not long enough to affect the meat one way or the other; so that you require no special management on the railway, except hanging the meat in its canvas perfectly clean, and seeing that the

Mr. *Mundella*—continued.

trucks are properly ventilated; and then that meat will be placed at once in a cool chamber and sent to the market as it is wanted, 10, or 15, or 100 quarters, or whatever quantity you choose. My belief is that we shall have in large towns like Sheffield a direct supply from America to central stores, and so into the mouths of the working men, and that we shall have meat back again at 5 *d.* and 6 *d.* per pound.

7125. It involves a certain process of distribution to get it into the mouths of the working men, does it not?—It would not be very difficult to get the working men to distribute it amongst themselves.

7126. Surely the storage of meat can be better accomplished alive than dead?—Certainly not; because, if you carry the animals alive, we know, from an experience of upwards of 30 years of the present century, and over 30 years of the past century, that the transportation of live animals entails deterioration and waste, and further that it is invariably attended by the propagation of contagious diseases.

7127. But the deterioration in the live animal is not so great as the deterioration of the dead meat, is it?—Certainly it is. Having devoted 10 or 12 years to the preservation of meat, and never having had a single cargo of beef across the Atlantic without ice in proper condition, I can state that the deterioration of the dead meat is practically nil. It is the loss of probably 2 lbs. or 3 lbs. of water from a quarter of beef by evaporation.

7128. Are you aware that cattle have been brought to this country from America in such fine condition that they have been sold alive at 50 *l.* a head?—I know; have we not sent our magnificent short-horned cattle to Australia?

7129. I was speaking of the supply of food, and not of prize animals; what deterioration can they have suffered when they fetched that price?—Very slight indeed, no doubt; but we have to take not the exceptions but the normal condition of the trade, and during eight months of the year the deterioration of live stock is infinitely greater than any possible deterioration of dead meat.

7130. But if they can find a means of bringing live stock safely to this country, surely you will admit that that is the most desirable way of bringing the cattle to this country?—I say that is the most undesirable way.

7131. Do you mean to say that the importation of live healthy cattle from America is an undesirable thing?—I mean to say that it is impossible to argue against the importation of live, healthy animals in such a channel that our cattle cannot possibly be contaminated. I believe that for the promotion of free trade, and for the proper feeding of the people here, the isolation of our own stock from all foreign stock is an essential; if you state to me that you wish to import live healthy cattle from Canada, it is impossible to adduce an argument against it, except that I think the people would be very foolish to send them alive instead of dead.

7132. You said that the danger of disease was from the east?—Yes, and not from Canada. We happen to have contaminated America by these eastern pestilences; although to the extreme west, from where the meat has come, to the best of my knowledge and belief, pleuro-pneumonia has not yet penetrated. We even took the trouble to send foot-and-mouth disease there, and

that

Mr. *Mundella*—continued.

that opened my eyes to the self-exterminating character of the malady, because it went through like a match laid to a train of gunpowder, and disappeared without any preventive measures whatever being taken.

7133. Do you know anything of the Spanish and Portuguese cattle which have been imported into this country?—I have seen a great number of them.

7134. Do they suffer deterioration from importation?—Very seriously; and very often many of them have been thrown over in the Bay of Biscay.

7135. They have been thrown over in the Bay of Biscay in a storm as dead meat would be, I suppose?—It is my opinion, and you may take it for what it is worth, that the transportation of a live bullock for slaughter across the ocean, if you can carry him dead, is a blunder.

7136. You argue on the assumption that the exclusion of all live cattle would leave England entirely free from cattle disease?– The exclusion of live stock imports would, without a single ounce of meat being brought from America, lower the price of meat in this country in five years. If our farmers had not the disease to contend with, my belief is that they could produce animals enough at lower prices to feed the whole country, and progressively to feed it.

7137. I have before me the report of the number of animals which were thrown overboard while in process of importation; and I find that, of 4,539 Spanish cattle imported into Thames Haven, only three were thrown overboard; and that from Portugal there were 4,209 imported, of which seven were thrown overboard; so that all the year round there were 31 cargoes; and 10 out of 10,000 cattle were thrown overboard in the year; do you consider that a large proportion?—That is very fortunate; but a great many of those had gone through a great deal of suffering.

Mr. *James Corry.*

7138. Do you know anything of the tinned meat trade from America?—I am personally aware that since I was in Texas they have started at Galveston the exportation of meat, and at Chicago, too, they have been tinning meat.

7139. In large quantities?—I am not an authority upon that point; I cannot tell you. Some years ago, before the means of transporting meat fresh as it is transported now were known, and before the conditions of the trade could be thoroughly brought about, I was instrumental in promoting the importation of tinned meat from South America, and very large quantities have been brought from Bopequa. The cost of tinning happens very materially to interfere with the trade as compared with the trade in fresh meat for curing, although, no doubt, it is a very important trade. We owe that, I think, to Judge Tindal's son, who introduced the Australian trade as far back as 1865, and great good he has done by it.

7140. It is used for ships' stores, is it not?—Yes.

Mr. *Wilbraham Egerton.*

7141. Do you know that the Spanish cattle arriving at Plymouth are used by contractors for the navy?—I am not aware of it personally.

7142. You do not know whether they have been tried to be kept, and whether they have improved in condition in this country after having been kept?—I should suppose that would be so from the simple fact that the Spanish cattle are working oxen, and many of them are tended most carefully all their lives, and they are accustomed to be handled; that is why they come over by ship very much better than other cattle. I have no doubt whatever that they would, with a little time, improve, though, as a rule, five or six days' journey by sea would require a fortnight or three weeks before the animals got into what a farmer would call real thriving condition again, laying on flesh well. I should suppose that the Oporto and Spanish cattle would come over better than the others.

Mr *Wilbraham Egerton*—continued.

7143. If they had anything like quarantine for a fortnight or three weeks, do you think they would lose condition?—You cannot deal with quarantine at all in connection with animals for slaughter.

7144. Are you in favour of allowing Spanish and Portuguese cattle to come alive into this country, as you said in 1873, because you think that their cattle are healthier?—Unfortunately, we have had some animals imported with foot-and-mouth disease; and my belief is that the country would benefit immensely if that could be turned into a dead-meat trade. Spain and Portugal are so far from the direct transit of the maladies from Bessarabia right through Hungary and Germany to this country, that there are many arguments in favour of Spain and Portugal being kept open; if you can deal with the trade partially, I know what it will be; the moment one country is allowed to do what another is not, then some foreign interposition occurs, and unfortunately for the British farmer, and the British stockowner, and the British meat consumer, foreign statements have had much greater weight than well founded statements made to our Government in our own country.

7145. Do you think that Holland takes sufficient precautions by its own laws to keep out cattle plague?—In the case of cattle plague I have no doubt it does, because it is such an easy thing to prevent it; but not in the case of foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia.

7146. Then why would you prohibit animals from Holland?—Because they have communicated disease to our cattle more than any other animals in the world.

7147. You are aware that they are now taking very stringent measures to stamp out pleuro-pneumonia?—I would trust no continental nations at all. In the case of the animals which pass through their frontier, to all appearance perfectly sound, the period of incubation may end on the German ocean, and that is sufficient to contaminate the whole of our stock; so that apparently healthy animals might cross Holland and give us disease.

7148. Would you be satisfied with slaughtering them at the port of landing?—I was satisfied; but I think you will find that even the Privy Council authorities at the present moment would declare that the foreign stock market system, in the case of cattle plague especially, has failed, and that you cannot trust to it.

7149. I am assuming that Holland takes sufficient precautions to keep out cattle plague?—You can trust nobody; you must trust yourselves.

Professor *Gamgee.*

25 June 1877.

Mr. *French.*

7150. Are you acquainted with the restrictions that are in force in Denmark with reference to these diseases?—Personally I am not; it is not a subject that is before me at the moment.

7151. Would it surprise you to hear that even the cattle trucks which take cattle out of the country are not allowed to return again?—Yes, I have no doubt of that, and I have no doubt that Denmark is normally quite as healthy as our own Sutherlandshire.

7152. Taking those regulations into consideration, do you not think that it would be safe to allow cattle to be imported from Denmark, or from countries which have such severe restrictions?—I can only judge from history. When we have allowed animals to come from Denmark during the past century we have had cattle plague conveyed by them to our shores. It was the Low Country cattle and the Danish cattle which led to the then Government abolishing the system of live stock imports, which gave us the finest stock in the world.

7153. That was in the last century?—That was in the last century.

7154. But these present restrictions in Denmark have been put in force since?—No doubt, because in the last century we were the leaders, and we always have been the leaders, in cattle plague prevention; only in the last century the scientific men had some power with the king, and the authorities; whereas, during this century, the scientific evidence has had very little weight upon the subject.

7155. Then we are much safer at present than we were in the last century as regards Denmark, are we not?—No, we are not, because we have behaved more irrationally. The moment they saw the disease they tried to prevent it. I have been actively pursuing the subject with only one object, and that was to rid this country of cattle disease, and I can state that I think there has been a tendency usually for public opinion to be in advance of legislation.

7156. Do you know what the price of meat is in New York at present?—No. When I was there that was the great difficulty that I had, for I carried out all these blowing air experiments over there, but the meat was somewhere about 30 or 35 cents per lb.; so that the export was an impossibility at that time from New York. It has been exceedingly low lately in the United States and in Montreal; no doubt it will be going up a little under the trade here, but they can produce any quantity.

7157. That means that there would be a surplus in the country after supplying New York, which they could not get rid of unless they sent it over here?—Certainly.

Mr. *Chamberlain.*

7158. Have you not said that the contagious virus from foot-and-mouth disease was extremely subtle?—It is.

7159. Can it be conveyed by offal?—Yes, it might be conveyed by offal; it might be conveyed by excreta.

7160. You would prohibit the export of hides and offal, then, I presume, as well as of live animal?—No, that would be a sort of refining of fine gold. What we are suffering from is importation of disease by means of live cattle, the communication of disease from living sick animals to living healthy animals; and if we stop that, the accidents, if I may use the expression, of the other trade are perfectly under control. Then everything that is dead is so easily disinfected. An animal that comes here in a state of incubation of foot-and-mouth disease pours forth gallons of saliva, each microscopic molecule of which is capable of contaminating nobody knows how many animals, if it finds a fit soil in which to work.

Mr. *Chamberlain*—continued.

7161. But if we are to submit to all these restrictions in order to get rid of the disease, it would seem to be very foolish to subject ourselves to the possibility of such accidents as you speak of?—If it is deemed desirable to extend them, it may be done. I should say that the country can be kept healthy, certainly free from pleuro-pneumonia, certainly free from cattle plague, and, as a general rule, quite free from foot-and-mouth disease, by abolishing the trade in live animals.

7162. We have been told that cattle plague is propagated by dead meat; do you agree in that opinion?—There are exceptional instances; for example, in Hungary I have seen cattle plague on a farm myself; hawkers have gone about selling the flesh of cattle affected with rinderpest; they have washed it in water, and thrown the water into the courtyard, and as the result of that there has been an outbreak of cattle plague.

7163. Then, in order to be perfectly safe, we must not only prohibit the import of live cattle, but also of offal, hides, and dead meat?—There are certain things in the world that are impossible.

7164. You do not answer my question. In order to be perfectly certain we should have to do that, should we not?—It might be considered an advantage from one point of view, but I think that the disadvantage to trade would, in that case, be such as to counterbalance the advantage.

7165. I am not asking you to balance the advantages, but whether, in order to be perfectly safe, it would not be necessary to prohibit the importation of offal, hides, and dead meat?—Yes.

7166. Would you exclude live sheep?—Yes; live sheep are capable of communicating foot-and-mouth disease, but not pleuro-pneumonia.

7167. We have been told by one witness that mutton cannot be successfully exported in the same way as beef; is that your experience?—My experience is that it is much more easily preserved than beef.

7168. Would you apply the same restrictions to the trade with Ireland?—Certainly not. I should look upon Ireland as an English county. I should deal uniformly with the cattle of our own three islands; but there has been a great deal of worrying of our home trade, and certainly interfering with the proper development of the foreign trade; because this scheduling of foreign countries, and these restrictions here and restrictions there, have been most prejudicial.

Mr. *Anderson.*

7169. When you speak of international contagion, what diseases do you include?—As affecting the meat supplies of this country, they are the cattle plague, the contagious pleuro-pneumonia, the lung plague, the aphthous disease, or foot-and-mouth disease, the sheep-pox, and sheep-scab. Those are the maladies that really affect our meat supply.

7170. When

Mr. *Anderson*—continued.

7170. When were those diseases imported?—At different times. Rinderpest was the cause, probably, of the severer restrictions which were imposed last century, though Mr. Headlan Greenhow and others believe (and there is reason for that belief) that pleuro-pneumonia was disseminated with cattle plague. To a certain extent we know that foot-and-mouth disease was all over the Continent.

7171. When did pleuro-pneumonia come to this country first?—The real invasion by pleuro-pneumonia of this country dates from 1842. We had its importation into the South of Ireland as far back probably as 1839, by cattle from the Hague. I am not certain that we had not some smuggling of cattle on the East coast of England into Norfolk before the free importation of live cattle.

7172. When was foot-and-mouth disease imported? — Foot-and-mouth disease was called "the epidemic." In the Royal Agricultural Society's Journal for the year 1841, you have a report by Professor Sewell, in which one or two veterinary surgeons pointed to the fact that this malady had been raging in France. We did not know the name of it. In 1840 and 1841, people were astounded by these diseases appearing; one was called the "new disease," and the other was christened "the epidemic," until the Germans reported that the one was their "Klauenseuche," and the other was their "Lungenseuche"; and it was from Germany that we learnt what the disease was. The foot-and-mouth disease came in first, and then quacks started up all over the country to cure the malady. Since it was not a malignant disease, they were very successful; but suddenly they encountered the pleuro-pneumonia, and after three or four attempts to cure it, the system of slaughtering as a means of getting salvage was adopted. When I first took up the subject, almost as a boy, I attacked the traffic in diseased animals as in its nature a vicious traffic. I was told that the diseases came from east winds or west winds, and that they might come from north wind, from cold wind, and from dry weather, and from all other causes combined; but the maladies date practically from the importation of live animals.

7173. Then your opinion is most decidedly that neither pleuro-pneumonia nor foot-and-mouth disease is generated in this country?—Certainly.

7174. And therefore that you would get quit of them be regulations?—Most assuredly.

7175. And you think that you could exterminate pleuro pneumonia in six months?—It is always a dangerous thing to prophesy unless you know beforehand what will happen, and six months may seem a very short time; but under adequate regulations, I should say that pleuro-pneumonia ought to be stamped out in these islands within six months.

7176. Supposing that the Privy Council made you a sort of cattle dictator, you could make such regulations as would do it?—I have no such desire; but I should consider myself unfit for my work if I did not exterminate the diseases within a very limited period of time.

7177. Ireland has very little communication with the Continent in live cattle, has she not?—Very little.

7178. Then how is it that foot-and-mouth disease always comes to us from Ireland?—It does

Mr. *Anderson*—continued.

not always come to us from Ireland. As much foot-and-mouth disease comes from Scotland as from Ireland; it depends entirely which way animals are moving.

7179. Some of the witnesses have told us that a great deal of it comes in at first from Ireland?—When I went to Waterford with Mr. Denny, the great pork factor, and was going over his great pork-curing establishment for the Privy Council, he said: "You see we have our pigs come here, and if the disease is brought into our market from England by any of the calves, we find the moment that one lot of pigs have got contaminated in our wooden pens, where we starve them before slaughtering, every succeeding lot for weeks after catch the disease."

7180. You said that foot-and-mouth disease was a self-exterminating disease; why does it not become self-exterminating in Ireland where they have no fresh contagion?—It does constantly every day, only we keep giving them fresh modicums of disease from England every week, which we always receive again with compound interest. If one case of cholera comes into this country it may generate a thousand cases, and then we are probably more contaminated than even the countries that send us cholera.

7181. You say that exclusion would completely stop the disease; was there not complete exclusion in the reign of George II.?—No.

7182. Was it not illegal to import animals?—I think it was in 1770, in the reign of George III., that we stopped the importation of live animals.

7183. Are you not aware that an Act was passed in the reign of George II., making it absolutely illegal to import cattle of any kind, even from Ireland?—I think it was in the reign of Charles II.

7184. Are you aware that during the operation of that Act, we had the worst outbreak of cattle disease that has been known in the country?—But it was in consequence of these outbreaks that the restrictions were imposed. I may mention that during one of the invasions the practice of inoculation started up, and I almost think that it was during the reign of George II., and afterwards during the reign of George III., the practice of inoculation was stopped, but the means which were adopted in this country, as it was thought, for the prevention of the disease, were means which favoured its propagation.

7185. Are you not aware that, before we had cattle disease in the country at all, an Act was passed in the reign of George II., not for the purpose of stopping the cattle disease, but with the avowed object of keeping up the rents in the country?—I am not personally aware of any such Act, except in reference to the Contagious Cattle Diseases. I have the whole of the Acts tabulated, and if any fact of that sort comes to my knowledge I shall be most happy to give it to you. In the reign of Charles II., an Act was passed for prohibiting imports of cattle even from Ireland. This, with regard to Ireland, was repealed by 5 Geo. III. c. 10. In the time of George II. certain temporary Cattle Plague Acts and Orders were prevalent, from 1745 to 1756; but in 1769, when the labours of Bates and Mortimer, Cullen and Layard, were fresh in men's minds, the 10th of George III. chapter 45, was passed.

7186. Have you got the preamble of the Act of George II.?—I have not.

7187. An

Professor *Gamgee.*

25 June 1877.

Mr. *Anderson*—continued.

7187. An Act was passed in the reign of George II. for prohibiting the import of cattle even from Ireland, and the preamble of that Act distinctly states that it was not for the purpose of preventing disease, but for the purpose of raising rents; so that there was complete prohibition of import of cattle at that time, and yet we had then the worst outbreak of cattle plague that was ever known?—The most distinguished Scotch physician taught us too well that that was not the case. The great Cullen, and Haller, the great physiologist, as far back as 1773, proved that it was pure contagion.

7188. Do you suppose that the outbreak of cattle disease in the time of George II. was not rinderpest?—I cannot state, but I know from the records of the last century, so far as it was possible for anybody with great care to read them, that in Ireland they repeatedly had anthrax and carbuncular fevers that were in no way allied to rinderpest.

7189. Then those are other contagious diseases than those which you have mentioned?—That is just the reason why I wish to make a remark as to the Texas cattle disease. We have an intermediate group between the contagious diseases and the non-contagious diseases. For example, it is represented in man by cholera. Cholera originates in India, and travels in the lines of communication between sick and healthy communities. The Texas cattle plague is not the cattle plague proper. The splenic fever of cattle in the Gulf of Mexico is due to the conditions of the soil and vegetation in the Gulf of Mexico; I traced it as being propagated by the excreta in the northern parts of the United States, but I could isolate it with a fence; it was from feeding on certain particular grasses. The bubonic plagues that have devastated the towns of Europe at different times have been propogated by special poisons; but they are not specific animal poisons such as operate in the epizootics.

7190. You do not know whether the cattle plague of the last century was the same as our rinderpest or not?—I happen to be the only person who has described the past outbreaks. I think they were five in number up to the last century, but we have every reason to believe, from all the symptoms that have been described, that in the last century rinderpest prevailed in this land.

7191. How do you suppose it got into the land?—It came from Denmark and the Low Countries, as has been proved by one of the greatest physicians that ever lived in this country.

7192. That must have been by the importation of hides, I suppose?—No; by the importation of animals.

Chairman.

7193. There was clearly a time when animals must have been imported freely, though not to any great extent; then, for a period, they were entirely stopped; and then again, after 1842, the prohibition was again withdrawn?—Yes.

Mr. *Anderson.*

7194. But in the last century, during the continuance of the entire prohibition, was it rinderpest that broke out then?—In the last century, wars led to the propagation of disease all over the European continent; this century it is the international cattle trade that has done it.

Mr. *Anderson*—continued.

7195. You have mentioned in your pamphlet several Acts; are you aware that there was one empowering the King to prevent the killing of cow calves?—There have been many foolish Acts of Parliament in days gone by.

7196. Are you aware that such an Act was passed on account of cattle plague being so bad that it threatened the complete extermination of our herds?—Yes, I remember that.

7197. You spoke of the Spanish live meat trade being prohibited as well as others, and you say that that would become a dead-meat trade; how would they manage about ice?—I should suppose that the Americans, who have their lakes of ice, will not continue long using ice. They are now using 10, or 20, or 30, or 50, or even 60 tons of ice per ship load, at a cost of about four dollars per ton, and they can by proper machinery, produce all that they will possibly want for about a sovereign, when crossing the Atlantic.

7198. You propose, that for the Spanish dead-meat trade and for the Continental dead-meat trade, there should be ice-machines?—Wherever they start.

7199. So as to get rid of the difficulty and the expense of ice?—Clearly.

Colonel *Kingscote.*

7200. You said that mutton was as easily carried as beef, did you not?—Yes, quite as easily.

7201. Do you say so from experience?—From my own experience. I preserved one day 18 sheep in New York, and sent nearly all of them across here. At one time I supplied them experimentally, merely for the purpose of showing what ought to be done eventually; but from London I supplied the Brazilian steamers, and they even stopped taking live sheep at Falmouth. All the meat went perfectly well.

7202. You consider that there is no difficulty about it?—No difficulty whatever.

7203. You told us that you had gone into the milk supply of London a good deal; do you know at all what is the per-centage of the whole milk supply that comes from the country?—I do not.

Sir *Arthur Peel.*

7204. Are there no diseases which are in your opinion indigenous to the 6,000,000 cattle in this country?—Certainly there are.

7205. What are they?—I found that a great many of those that were indigenous were unknown. For example, in Lanarkshire, I found a most interesting disease, fragility of bone, which was always described as occurring in Saxony, but that arises from the soil. Then we have our braxy sheep.

7206. But you think it is impossible that those three diseases, which you have styled international diseases, should have had their origin here?—It is absolutely impossible.

7207. Upon what do you ground that statement?—I ground that statement upon what I consider to be exact science and knowledge upon the subject. If a chemist or any person thought that he could produce oxygen out of ammonia, or anything of that sort, a scientific man would tell him that it was an impossibility.

7208. Without

Sir *Arthur Peel*—continued.

7208. Without going into the question of producing oxygen out of ammonia, and confining ourselves for the present to foot-and-mouth disease, you will possibly not dispute the historical statements, at any rate, of the report signed by Professor Brown? — I have always disputed many of the historical statements of their reports.

7209. Will you tell me whether you would dispute this statement: that in the year 1839, the foot-and-mouth disease broke out in this country?—Certainly; it was introduced into this country.

7210. When there was no import?—I have good reason to believe that there was smuggling of cattle into Ireland, and we had a great outbreak in Bristol. The earlier reports of the Royal Agricultural Society first directed me towards that foreign importation.

7211. It first appeared close to London, did it not?—Then in that case it is probable that it was brought in by Dutch cows in the marshes. What I discovered was this: that prior to the importation of live animals there were many tentative importations that were not heeded at all by the laws, and I believe that Mr. Clare Sewell Read has told me that he has no doubt whatever that an occasional import occurred even in Norfolk; but upon that subject he can tell you more than I can.

7212. But, as I read this history, the whole of it seems to militate against your theory that foot-and-mouth disease is an induced disease. First of all, I see it stated in this report that it originated here, and from 1853 to 1861 we have no record whatever of foot-and-mouth disease, and yet cattle were coming in?—I am not at all astonished. We have no record now of one tithe of the interesting facts that ought to be before you to convince everybody of the truth of our position.

7213. Do you think that if foot-and-mouth disease had been habitually introduced into this country from 1853 to 1861 there would be no record of it?—It was habitually introduced.

7214. And you do not agree with this history?—I do not call that history.

7215. You say that this is not history?—Certainly not. If you compare the whole of the reports of the Veterinary Department of the Privy Council with such reports as you had from the Medical Department during Mr. Simon's time, you will see the difference.

7216. You stated that the export of live beasts was a very foolish commercial enterprise, and the honourable Member for Sheffield asked you whether introducing into this country a beast which fetched 50*l.* was a foolish commercial enterprise; you said that it was an exceptional case, and that you preferred to deal with averages; do you dispute this statement of Mr. Giblett's, that the live trade with America was a good trade; that he had consignments every week; that it was an increasing trade; that out of a cargo of 180, two or three beasts at most were injured; and that the average price which the animals so consigned to him fetched was 30*l.*?—It so happens that I never have agreed with Mr. Giblett from the very first day, many years ago, that he began to discuss this matter in the papers. The history of the American trade shows that the dead-meat trade is possible under the present conditions, at all events during eight months of the year, and the live-stock trade is only possible during about three or four months, because I

Sir *Arthur Peel*—continued.

happened to be here when Mr. Giblett himself stated that the consignors would not send the cattle across in rough weather, or during the winter, autumn, or spring.

7217. But an idea has been started before this Committee that the dead meat would be very well in the winter, and that the live meat would take its place in the summer?—I can assure you most positively that the dead-meat trade will do as well in the summer as it will in the winter. I have had meat come across the Atlantic in the month of July. What we want on this side of the Atlantic is to establish the cold meat store system, and to regulate the traffic in the proper way.

Major *Allen.*

7218. Have you seen the conditions under which they keep their meat in New York in the summer months, and send it up to market?—I have seen a great deal of provisions and meat kept in cold chambers with ice over a metal roof. Within the past five or six years I know (certainly not from personal observation, for I have not been there) that in Chicago, in the process of salting in the summer, they have adopted very important improvements for having currents of cold air round their meat, and drying it and cooling it properly before they move it.

7219. I believe that the meat for the New York market comes from Chicago?—Yes, and unfortunately a great deal of it comes alive. A great deal of the meat that comes to this country gets bruised, owing to the transit over the country, which they would like to stop.

7220. Do you consider that their arrangements for keeping meat in New York are better than they are here?—Yes.

7221. You come to the conclusion that if an animal were sent over here from New York alive, he would make less money than if he were sent over dead?—Yes, as a rule. Take a thousand animals and send them dead or alive under good conditions, and the dead meat would cost less to carry, and would make more money than the live animal.

7222. Is carbonic acid a real disinfectant?—No, carbonic acid is not a disinfectant; carbonic acid merely excludes the air. It was supposed that meat would not putrefy in carbonic acid, but it does.

Mr. *Chaplin.*

7223. You said just now, in answer to the Member for Birmingham, that, in order to be perfectly safe, it would be necessary to exclude offal and hides, and dead meat as well as live cattle?—I do not object to the importation of those articles, because I think it is sufficient to be practically safe. To be absolutely safe, of course, we might have to isolate our country in such a way that we should never submit to.

7224. I suppose a human being might convey contagion?—Certainly, and a human being has conveyed foot-and-mouth disease.

7225. Then to make ourselves perfectly secure, using the term in the same sense as the Member for Birmingham did, I suppose we should have to exclude all human beings from an infected country?—I am not the advocate of any such measure.

7226. Those are extreme measures, which I presume you would not recommend?—Certainly not.

Professor *Gamgee.*

25 June 1877.

Chairman.

7227. With regard to your answer to an honourable Member just now, as to your views with respect to the introduction of foot-and-mouth disease in 1839, and what the honourable Member described as the history of the Privy Council, the two are probably not quite so wide apart as was represented, because I would call your attention to the fact that the Privy Council, in their report, say: "In the summer of 1839 foot-and-mouth disease first appeared at Stratford, in the neighbourhood of London, whence it was soon carried to the Smithfield Market. As to the manner of the introduction of the disease, nothing definite is known. Foreign cattle were not imported at the time, but it is not unlikely that some surplus ship stores might have contracted the disease at a foreign port, and on being in this country have communicated it to home stock. From 1853 to 1861, no records of the progress of foot-and-mouth disease are to be found in agricultural and veterinary journals. Probably it remained during those years in such a condition that no special attention was directed to it." Therefore, the Privy Council suggest in their report the possibility of foot-and-mouth disease having come from abroad?—Yes.

7228. As to the American live-meat trade, what, I suppose, you would represent as your view is that the dead-meat trade, if properly established, would be a possible trade all the year round, whilst the live-meat import from America can only be carried on under favourable conditions of weather, and that the expenses of bringing the dead meat are in themselves less than the expenses of bringing it alive?—Quite so. My view is that the dead-meat trade, both for home and for foreign purposes, is the best. For foreign purposes it is unquestionably best, both for the trader and for ourselves; but there are conditions in connection with the foreign trade which render live stock importers and consignors disposed not to risk the expense of adopting the dead-meat system. I think it is very well known that salesmen, like Mr. Giblett, receive twice as much for the sale of a foreign bullock as they receive for the sale of an English bullock, and they have a tax on the foreign trade which they are not at all anxious to get rid of. They charge for the sale of a foreign bullock double of what they charge for the sale of an English bullock.

Mr. *Mundella.*

7229. It is an agreement; there are two parties to the bargain; there is no tax?—They make more money out of the foreign meat alive than they would make out of the foreign meat dead.

Chairman.

7230. Do I correctly understand you to say that they are, therefore, interested in one particular trade as against the other?—I am assured that that is so.

7231. Do you speak of your own knowledge about this?—I speak of that which I have constantly known as operating. They receive, I believe, 8 *s.* to sell a foreign bullock, and 4 *s.* to sell an English one. I believe Mr. Read will explain that to you as a farmer; he knows what he pays; and that is the custom of the trade, so far as I know. I cannot vouch for it personally, for I never received such a commission; but they have a direct interest in perpetuating the live-stock trade from abroad as against the dead-meat trade.

Chairman—continued.

7232. Do you mean that there is any advantage to a man in selling the live animals, as compared with selling the animals when dead?—My own impression is that there is none as regards the dead meat.

Mr. *Mundella.*

7233. Have you any knowledge about it at all?—I have not. I wish to add this. That vested interests are entirely in favour of the live cattle trade which is in existence; and those interests would suffer, and must suffer, if the dead meat went past them to the dead meat salesman in the market; so that the persons who are selling the live cattle here are not the persons who sell the dead meat as a rule.

Chairman.

7234. One trader is naturally interested in preventing the competition of another trade?——Yes.

7235. I understood you to say that the commission which is charged on a foreign animal is double that which is charged on a home animal?—Yes: that is the rule.

7236. With regard to the examination of the honourable Member for Glasgow, the Act that he referred to, and which you have mentioned in your pamphlet, is probably correctly stated as being an Act of Charles II., for I see that there is an Act in the reign of Charles II. against the importation of cattle from Ireland and other parts beyond the seas, and fish taken by foreigners, the preamble of which is: "Whereas by an Act of this present Parliament, intituled, 'An Act for the Encouragement of Trade,' amongst other things, some provision was made for the preventing of coming in of vast numbers of cattle, whereby the rents and values of the land of this kingdom were much fallen, and like daily to fall more, to the great prejudice, detriment, and impoverishment of this kingdom; which, nevertheless, hath by experience been found to be ineffectual; and the continuance of any importation, either of the lean or fat cattle, dead or alive, hereinafter specified, not only unnecessary, but very destructive to the welfare of this kingdom." That was in the year 1666. That is probably the Act that you refer to in your pamphlet?—I presume so. I have not had the opportunity of going over it.

7237. Are you aware whether that Act remained in force until it was repealed by 5, George III., c. 10?—I am not aware.

Mr. *W. E. Forster.*

7238. Would you not admit that that Act was passed quite irrespectively of cattle plague?—Certainly; apparently so.

Mr. John Soulby, called in; and Examined.

Mr *Soulby.*

Chairman.

7239. I believe you are the Secretary of the North Riding of Yorkshire Chamber of Agriculture?—I am.

Chairman—continued.

7240. And you live at Malton in Yorkshire?—I do.

7241. Can you tell the Committee what are the

Chairman—continued.

the restrictions that have been in force in your district during the last outbreak of cattle plague?—With regard to the East Riding, the Privy Council Order prohibited the movement of any cattle from any other district into the East Riding, and provided for the movement of cattle in the East Riding by means of passes; but it was not possible to get cattle out of the East Riding at all.

7242. Could you send cattle into the East Riding?—We could not send cattle into the East Riding at all. I am not sure whether we could do so with a pass, but I think not.

7243. How did that affect the other Ridings?—It affected the other Ridings very injuriously.

7244. Were the fairs and markets prohibited in your riding?—The fairs and markets were prohibited by the Privy Council Order in the East Riding, and by an Order of the Local Authority in the North Riding; so that our markets were entirely closed, and we had no means whatever of disposing of the cattle.

7245. The North Riding at that time had no signs of disease, had it?—The North Riding has had no suspicion of cattle plague whatever.

7246. I suppose you would represent to the Committee that the restrictions which were imposed from a fear of the disease injuriously affected those districts where no disease existed?—Undoubtedly.

7247. And that your healthy cattle might have been sent into the East Riding without being prohibited?—Our healthy cattle might have been sent anywhere without being stopped, and in our view they ought to have been.

7248. Does that lead you to think that there is some disadvantage in the present system of local restrictions?—Yes, undoubtedly, The local authorities of the various counties make different orders; we unfortunately are just on the borders of the North Riding and of the East Riding, and the order applies to one part of our borough and does not apply to the other part.

7249. Did your local orders in the district which was healthy continue in force even longer than those in the infected districts?—The orders which were in force in the North Riding continued in force for more than a week after the removal of the restrictions in the infected district.

7250. And you represent that as an argument in favour of any regulations of the sort being entrusted to some central authority instead of being left to the discretion of the different localities?—The feeling is very strongly in that direction. It caused a very great amount of inconvenience, and it was represented to the magistrates in quarter sessions that there was quite sufficient time for them to have removed the inconvenience if they had thought proper to take action in the matter.

7251. You represent that if the whole of those regulations were issued by a central authority, you would have more skilful officers appointed by that central authority for carrying them out, and that the convenience of the public would be more studied by uniformity of system than by the varied arrangements which are made in time of panic?—Yes, that is precisely my view.

7252. Do you think that the farmers generally throughout your district would be ready to undertake the payment of the inspectors appointed by a central authority instead of by the local authority?—I do not see why the superintendents of the police, who are there already, should not act as inspectors for the purpose of giving passes.

7253. But supposing that a system were adopted such as I have understood you to suggest, viz, that the Privy Council, as a central authority, should have the issuing of all regulations in case of cattle plague, and in case of the other diseases, and for that purpose should have inspectors, who probably would be more skilful than many of the local inspectors, do you think that there would be any objection raised by the farmers of your district to these inspectors being paid out of the local rates, as they are now, though they would be then appointed by a central authority?—That is not exactly what I did suggest. What I suggested was, that the Privy Council should issue orders as to what was to be done, in the same way as they did in the recent case in the East Riding, and that the ordinary local authorities should see those orders of the Privy Council carried out

7254. Then I understand that you would not suggest such a transference of authority as would enable the Privy Council to appoint inspectors to see their regulations properly administered?—I was of opinion that they had sufficient authority now to appoint inspectors, and to send inspectors in case of need.

7255. You do not think that it would be necessary to give them power to appoint the inspectors throughout the country, so as to insure united action in case of an outbreak of disease?—I do not think it would.

7256. What has been the effect of the cattle plague in your country?—It has been a very great injury to the trade. Butchers who wanted cattle did not know where to find them. They went, perhaps, to those who were large farmers, and they would get their cattle there with the least trouble, and perhaps at the highest price, whilst a man with two or three fat beasts living in a remote district, hardly knew where to get a market for his stock at all, because there was no market, and hardly any open competition. Then there was a difficulty, again, that if those small men could not sell their cattle they could not meet their bills, and the tradesmen suffered in consequence, and it was a general state of injury throughout.

7257. In fact, by the introduction of the disease, the whole trade in your district has been very much injured?—It has.

7258. What would you suggest to the Committee as a means of preventing this in the future; would you restrict the import of cattle?—I would restrict the importation of live animals from any country where cattle plague has ever been known to exist.

7259. Would you do that on account of the outbreaks which have taken place this year and in 1872?—On account of the outbreaks which took place in 1872 and in 1877, which I think prove that we are unable to check the outbreak of cattle plague from time to time if we continue to import live animals from countries where cattle plague exists, or can exist.

7260. Do you mean to represent to the Committee that you will stop the whole import of cattle

Mr. *Soulby.*

25 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

cattle from foreign countries, or that you would only stop it from such countries as did not take sufficient precautions to prevent the danger of the outbreak of the disease amongst them?—I would not stop the importation of foreign cattle from those countries from which it was practicable to bring them; but we have had experience that cattle plague has been imported twice within a very short period, and on each occasion to our own local injury, and I am here to protest that injury being repeated.

7261. If it could be shown that in the case of Denmark, for instance, as represented to this Committee, they have now for 100 years not had an outbreak of cattle plague, that pleuro-pneumonia is unknown at this time in the country, and that they go so far in taking precautions as against the import from other countries as to prevent even railway trucks from coming back that have once carried cattle into that country; would you except Denmark from the general prohibition, and allow cattle to come from a country which is so protected?—Most certainly.

7262. If it could be shown that the Spanish and Portuguese trade was equally free from disease, you do not think that restrictions should be placed upon the importation from those countries?—No; I do not think there would be any necessity for doing so.

7263. What I understand you to say, then, is that so long as the farmers whom you represent are secured against the possibility of the import of cattle plague, they have no wish to stop the import of live animals from countries that are fairly protected?—That is quite the view that I represent. We have no desire to stop the importation of meat, but only the importation of foreign diseases.

7264. I suppose that in that case you would not advocate the entire abolition of the import of cattle in favour of a dead-meat trade?—I would not advocate the abolition of the import of foreign cattle where it can be done practically with safety, but we do not want to incur any risks.

7265. And from countries where we have not those securities you would suggest that the supply of meat sent should be a dead-meat supply instead of a supply of live animals?—Certainly.

7266. With regard to admitting cattle for store purposes, do you think that it would be advisable to admit them freely from countries where the restrictions allowed of the import for slaughter?—I see no objection to their introduction where safety was assured.

7267. Either for slaughter or for store purposes, you would allow the import from any country which gave us sufficient guarantees of immunity from disease on their part?—Yes.

7268. With regard to the importation of stores from suspected countries, if I may so call them, would you prohibit them entirely?—Altogether.

7269. You would not have them under quarantine?—I would not have them at any time.

7270. Do you represent to the Committee that the farmers are quite prepared to adopt any restrictions that may be thought necessary for stamping out cattle plague, should it occur?—Yes, they are quite alive to the necessity of the most stringent regulations in that case.

7271. Your attention has probably been called to the proposal that was made some years ago for

Chairman—continued.

allowing a certain area to be taken round a district where infection had shown itself, and applying the whole of those strict regulations to that area; do you think that that would meet with the approval of the farmers?—It would meet with the approval of the Yorkshire farmers.

7272. Even although the animals might not have been in contact at all, but might be on a neighbouring farm, you think that the farmers would submit to having these strict regulations placed upon them for the purpose of stamping out the disease if it occurred again?—Yes, should the authorities think it necessary. I think they would regard it as a necessary evil.

7273. With regard to pleuro-pneumonia, are they in favour of any stronger regulations with reference to that disease?—I do not know that they are. The pleuro-pneumonia regulations are somewhat defective, in my opinion. I think that where an outbreak of pleuro-pneumonia occurs in a herd, the healthy animals that were fit for the butcher might properly be removed from the premises for immediate slaughter.

7274. Would you allow them to go into the market for the purpose of sale for slaughter?—Certainly not.

7275. What you mean by that is, that they should be removed by a butcher and taken to his slaughter-house for slaughter?—Yes.

7276. Have you at all considered what has been represented to this Committee, namely, the probability of its being necessary, with the view of stamping out pleuro-pneumonia in the country, to adopt very strict regulations generally throughout the country as to the movement of the cattle?—I have.

7277. Do you, speaking for the farmers of your district, think that they would be willing to submit to such regulations with a view of stamping out the disease, as have been pointed out to this Committee?—I do not think they would; I think they would consider the cure almost worse than the disease.

7278. Is that with regard to pleuro-pneumonia?—That is with regard to pleuro-pneumonia, because it remains in the system of the animal for such a long period of time that it would practically close the fairs and markets for a year.

7279. You think that any restrictions which, for the sake of stamping out pleuro-pneumonia, might possibly last for one year, would be considered to be so oppressive that the farmers would think that the pleuro-pneumonia would be cured at too great a cost?—Perhaps that is rather a strong way of expressing it, but I do not think that they would be at all satisfied to have their fairs and markets closed for a year.

7280. Therefore, if the stamping out of pleuro-pneumonia throughout the country necessitated regulations of such a stringent nature, you think, speaking for the farmers in your district, that they would prefer that they should not be adopted?—I think they would consider that pleuro-pneumonia might be practically exterminated without such severe measures as that.

7281. You say that it might be practically exterminated; you are aware that it is very prevalent at the present moment throughout England?—I am aware that it is prevalent.

7282. How would you consider that it might be practically exterminated with less severe measures than that?—Pleuro-pneumonia breaks out upon

Chairman—continued.

upon a farm, and the animal that is affected is killed. The fat animals ought to be sold, and sent to be slaughtered before they are affected; and stringent regulations should be made to prevent the removal from that infected farm of any of the other animals that are there.

7283. You think that by isolating every centre where the disease had broken out, and preventing the animals that had been in contact with any diseased animals leaving that centre except for the purpose of slaughter, you could stamp it out by regulations applying all these orders to a given district?—I think you would do so without the necessity of stopping markets and fairs, which is a very serious measure to take.

7284. You would like to see measures adopted with regard to infected districts without stopping the market?—Certainly.

7285. Would you make any alteration in the compensation either for cattle plague or pleuro-pneumonia from what exist at present?—No; I think they are both satisfactory. The compensation is fixed, I believe, at three-fourths of the value of the animal when healthy; but practically the farmer does not get quite that, because at the time when the inspector is called in, the animal is looking perhaps worth 3*l.* or 4*l.* less than he was before he broke down.

7286. That is the regulation as to pleuro-pneumonia; the compensation as to cattle plague is not upon the same scale, is it?—If it is not, I think it ought to be.

7287. I believe that the compensation is one-half for an animal slaughtered for cattle plague?—A farmer gets cattle plague through no fault of his own, and I think that he ought to be compensated for the disease that has been brought to him.

7288. You think that the same rule should apply to both pleuro-pneumonia and cattle plague, and that three-fourths of the value should be the compensation given?—Yes.

7289. With regard to foot-and-mouth disease, do you think that the present regulations are sufficient?—I think they are sufficient if they are properly carried out.

7290. Speaking of foot-and-mouth disease, it has been suggested that, to stamp out that disease in this country, if you were to stop the import from abroad it would, from its infectious nature, require very stringent regulations with regard to that also; do you think that the farmers would submit to stricter regulations than at present exist for the purpose of stamping out foot-and-mouth disease?—I am afraid that the Yorkshire farmers have had almost sufficient restrictions of any kind at present. They would not be disposed to submit to it, I fear.

7291. May I gather that the restrictions to which you refer, to which they have submitted, are those which have been placed upon them in consequence of the outbreak of cattle plague?—Yes.

7292. Under those restrictions, practically, the markets and fairs have been closed, and movement generally has been stopped throughout the district?—Yes.

7293. You think that any regulations that were made generally throughout the country for the purpose of stamping out foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia of a nature at all akin to those which have been necessary during the cattle plague outbreak would not be tolerated for any time by farmers?—I do not think they would. They would not consider them necessary; they would consider them too great an evil to be borne.

7294. Do you think that the restrictions that at present exist are sufficient, if properly carried out, for dealing with foot-and-mouth disease?—I think they are, but I do not think that they are properly carried out.

7295. You mean that the large amount of foot-and-mouth disease which exists in the country is due not so much to the want of regulation as to the want of their proper administration?—Yes.

7296. Would you adopt the same regulations that you have suggested for pleuro-pneumonia with regard to foot-and-mouth disease where it broke out; that is to say, the isolation of the spot?—Yes; I have no doubt that those regulations would be effectual if it were not that they were broken through. Supposing foot-and-mouth disease broke out on a farm where there is a considerable number of animals, and that one of the animals takes the disease, he goes through it, perhaps, in three or four days, but before the end of the time they may have it for a month, and then you want a certain time to get clear of the infection before the animal is fit to move again on the highway; so that, practically, you ought to shut the place up for a few weeks after the last animal has had it.

7297. Those are restrictions which you think the farmers would submit to in case foot and-mouth disease broke out in a district; and you would suggest that the animals should be isolated for a given time, until it was quite clear, not only that the infection had disappeared from the herd, but that any chance of its being spread had disappeared also?—Where foot-and-mouth disease had broken out, I would suggest that there should be no movement of animals off that farm until it was certified to be clear of disease.

7298. By the inspector?—By the inspector.

7299. If they were limited to that extent, you believe that those restrictions would be submitted to by the farmers?—I do.

7300. And you think, as I understand, that, if they were thoroughly carried out, they would be sufficient to get rid of the disease?—I think that they would be effectual in getting rid of it.

7301. Notwithstanding the very large amount of that disease that there is throughout the country?—A large amount of disease is carried about from market to market. Beasts are bought, and they go into a market, and they get infected, and then they are sold, and they go away to a farm. With us, farmers practically isolate their beasts at first now to see whether they take this disease or not.

7302. You represent that by isolation in every instance where the disease broke out, you would prevent the markets and fairs being the centres they now are of spreading the disease?—Yes; I do not think that we have, in Yorkshire, at present, any foot-and-mouth disease of any consequence.

7303. At the same time there is a good deal of it about the country, I suppose?—Yes.

7304. Do you attribute your having a decrease of the disease in Yorkshire to the recent cattle-plague regulations?—I should think it is very likely caused by that.

7305. Have you had it in Yorkshire to any extent?

Mr. *Soulby.*

25 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

extent?—We have not had it to any extent for two years.

7306. Are you able to speak of the whole of Yorkshire?—I am able to speak of the North and East Ridings; we are quite on the border.

7307. You have not had foot-and-mouth disease there for two years?—I think not.

7308. Therefore the regulations have not affected the case?—Possibly not. We could not stamp it out if it was not there, you know.

7309. Have you had much pleuro-pneumonia lately in the North and East Ridings?—We have had a good deal.

7310. Though you have been tolerably free for some time, you have had pleuro-pneumonia?—We have had pleuro-pneumonia, I will not say prevalent, but there have been a good many instances of it in our neighbourhood.

7311. I suppose you would still be liable to animals being sent into the market that have been in contact with diseased animals if it became publicly known that pleuro-pneumonia had broken out?—I should think so. I have no doubt that animals are often sent into the market after the owner of them knows that he has got a disease of some sort in his herd.

7312. That rather points to a danger in the line which you have suggested; that is to say, of merely isolating particular spots where the disease was developed, for the purpose of stamping out pleuro-pneumonia?—I am speaking rather of the fat market rather than of the lean market. When a man suspects that there is something wrong, and he has 50 or 60 fat beasts tied up, he very naturally sends them to the butcher as soon as possible.

7313. Still they are liable to come in contact in the fat market with the store animals which are exposed in the same market?—Yes, they would be, no doubt.

7314. So that there is no absolute security for stamping out the disease in that way?—No. I do not regard pleuro-pneumonia as being so infectious as cattle plague and foot-and-mouth disease.

7315. But there is a greater danger, I suppose, from its lying in the animal very often for a longer period?—It will often lie in the animal, I should say, for six months: I have known it myself break out in an animal which had been isolated for four months.

7316. And that renders it excessively difficult to calculate on preventing the disease from breaking out in any particular district?—You could not.

7317. Can you speak as to the effect of foot-and-mouth disease in sheep?—It is always very injurious when it gets into a flock of sheep.

7318. You have not for some time suffered from that either, have you?—We have not, but three or four years ago we had a good deal of it. I know a case in which 300 ewes broke down at the time that the rams were put to them, and the result was that instead of nearly the whole of them being in lamb, there were only 50 of them in lamb; 250 ewes out of the flock were barren.

7319. And that was naturally a great loss to the supply of meat in the country?—Certainly,

7320. I suppose you would generally submit to the Committee that although you are not willing to submit to very strong restrictions for the purpose of eradicating these diseases; they are so fatal in their influence that farmers would be

Chairman—continued.

prepared to submit to some restrictions for the purpose of eradicating them?—Yes; they would be willing to submit to some restrictions, certainly, for the purpose of eradicating foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia where it was necessary, where the disease existed; but they would not like to submit to a general order closing healthy districts.

7321. To sum up your evidence, it amounts to this, does it not; that whilst the farmers would submit to restrictions where the disease had shown itself, they would not, in your opinion, submit to a general regulation for the purpose of stamping out the disease?—They would not like to do so.

7322. Whilst asking for the stoppage of foreign import, in order to prevent the introduction of disease from those countries where disease exists, you are prepared to recommend to the Committee that the import of foreign live animals from any country which can give us security as to the healthy state of its animals should be allowed?—Yes, that quite expresses my view.

Mr. *Chaplin.*

7323. Your chamber represents the East Riding, does it not?—We are on the borders of the East Riding; the river goes right through the borough; we may be said to be partly in the East Riding, and partly in the North Riding.

7324. There are a great many cattle bred in that district, I suppose?—Yes, a great number round about us, both in the North and in the East Ridings.

7325. Can you tell me what effect the fear of cattle disease and those other diseases which have been referred to has upon breeders; would they breed a greater number of cattle if they were secure from the fear of disease?—I have no doubt that they would. It deters a good many from breeding. If the healthy stock could be assured from invasion, it would certainly be an encouragement to breeding.

7326. You would advocate the stopping of all import of live cattle from countries from which there is the least risk or fear of disease?—Yes, certainly.

7327. I understand you to say that if that was done, and we got all the security from disease which you desire, you consider that there would be a very large increase in the breeding of cattle in your district?—Yes, besides leaving out altogether the loss occasioned by the loss of weight from foot-and-mouth disease, and those kind of things, there would be an increase in breeding as well.

7328. Do you think there would be a large increase?—There would be a considerable increase.

7329. Do you think the increase would be sufficient to compensate for that loss of the live cattle which you would prohibit from coming into the country?—I think that it would do more than that.

Mr. *Assheton.*

7330. Have you any knowledge of the West Riding, and of the regulations which they have had in force there?—I believe that the West Riding County Sessions passed much the same orders as the North Riding County Sessions; that is to say, they closed all the country markets and fairs, whilst the boroughs and corporations kept

Mr. *Assheton*—continued.

kept theirs open; consequently, the small towns were placed at a great disadvantage in their trade, as compared with the larger ones.

7331. Can you tell me whether the foot-and-mouth disease has been prevalent in the West Riding?—We are 20 miles off the West Riding where I reside, and I cannot say whether it has or not.

Mr. *W. E. Forster.*

7332. Was the prohibition of fairs and markets in the East Riding by the local authority, or by the central government?—In the East Riding it was by the central government.

7333. And in the North Riding by the local authority?—In the North Riding by the local authority.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

7334. You are aware that the central department, in 1874, renewed its permissive powers to local authorities to pass stricter regulations than those in the Act of Parliament with regard to foot-and-mouth disease; did you avail yourself of that power in the North Riding?—No, we did not.

7335. Nor in the East Riding?—Nor in the East Riding.

7336. I gather from what you state that, so far as you know the feeling of the farmers, they would not be prepared to stop markets on account of foot-and-mouth disease?—Not for any considerable length of time.

7337. Or to stop the general movements of cattle?—Or to stop the general movement of cattle.

Sir CHARLES ALEXANDER WOOD, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

7338. I BELIEVE you are the Deputy-chairman of the Great Western Railway?—I am.

7339. Have you been deputy-chairman for any length of time?—Since 1865.

7340. Before that, I think you were one of Her Majesty's Emigration Commissioners?—I was for nearly 15 years.

7341. Have you turned your attention at all to the treatment of the transit of Irish cattle?—I was for some time trustee of the estates of the late Marquis of Londonderry in the north of Ireland, and I had occasion to visit the counties of Derry and Down from time to time. I think it was in the autumn of 1864 that, being in Londonderry, I was requested by the agent, who was also the agent of Lord Templemore, and who farmed very largely in that county, to see whether it would be possible to improve the transit of the Irish stock to England, and whether any arrangements could be then made which would facilitate the marketing of the Irish stock. He told me that he had lately followed some of his own stock from Derry to Glasgow, and that he considered that the animals had deteriorated in condition after their shipment at Derry, and prior to their sale to the butchers in Glasgow, to the extent of about 2*l.* per head. I had been familiar with the practice, which then existed in the north of Ireland, that pigs, instead of being sold alive and shipped alive to Great Britain, were killed where they were fed and shipped in carcases; and it occurred to me then that, if the same practice could be pursued with other descriptions of live stock, it probably would get over the difficulty of which Mr. Colquhoun complained.

7342. Did you visit any parts of Ireland for the purpose of investigating that idea?—Yes; from Derry I went to Belfast, and I there inspected the wharves and the mode of shipment of the live stock; I went then to Dundalk, which is one of the largest places of export in the north of Ireland; and from thence I went south to almost all the ports, including Waterford. I did not visit Cork in that year.

7343. Did you inspect the different lines of steamers to satisfy yourself as to the mode in which the transit was conducted?—The mode of shipment, I think, was pretty much the same at that time at all the ports. All the cattle were shipped,

Chairman—continued.

not in cattle steamers, but in steamers which carried passengers as well as cattle. That, to a certain extent, influences the mode of shipment, because the cattle cannot be shipped until the hold in which the cargo is carried has been closed; and, inasmuch as passenger steamers sail at fixed times, the time left for the shipment of live stock is necessarily brief. I found that cattle were not collected in any depôts or places convenient for the accommodation of cattle prior to shipment, but they were all standing at the open wharves, and were driven hastily on board so soon as the holds were closed and the time for shipment was announced. That necessarily hurries and frightens the cattle, and that appeared to me a bad arrangement.

7344. Do you think, from the arrangement that you saw, that there was any great probability of diseases being engendered from the treatment that the cattle had to go through?—I am speaking of some years ago, and since then, no doubt, improvements may have been effected; but when I returned to England, I communicated with persons in the trade to ascertain whether at that time any injury was experienced from the mode in which the Irish cattle reached their hands. At that time I believe the Irish horned cattle were chiefly fat cattle, and that a very limited number of stores reached England. The late Mr. Slater, a well-known West-end butcher, who had probably at that day the largest and best trade at the West-end, was my informant; and his description to me of the Irish ox at that time was this: that no better animal to look at came to hand, but that by treatment in transit it was so bruised that he had ceased to buy Irish cattle. I pursued my inquiries further at that time, and a salesman at Southall Market, who sold Irish cattle largely, told me this fact: that if the cattle missed one market, and remained on hand, and were not sold until the next, they were very frequently lame, and he could not assign any cause for it. Putting these circumstances together, in communication with the present Lord Bessborough, and his brother on the Great Western Board, Mr. Frederick Ponsonby, and the late Marquis of Lansdowne, the late Colonel Villiers Stuart, and Lord Lismore, we met frequently from time to time, I think, for two or three years afterwards, to see whether it would not be pos-

Sir *C. A. Wood.* 25 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

sible to form a company to introduce the killing of fat stock in Ireland, and sending that stock to London as carcases instead of as live animals. The difficulties of changing the course of trade were great, and although we met and had frequent intercourse with some leading salesmen in this town, at that time disease had not shown itself to such an extent as to make it probable that there would be a general movement in favour of meat as against live animals, and nothing came of it at that time.

7345. Did you visit Cork afterwards?—I visited Cork two or three years afterwards. With regard to Waterford, I am frequently there. The Great Western Railway Company has a line of daily steamers between Waterford and Milford, and since that period I have also crossed, by different lines, with cattle.

7346. I understood you to say that you had visited Cork on the first occasion?—I did not.

7347. Subsequently, had they created wharves and depôts at Cork for the purpose of the trade to this country?—In consequence of the great outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease which took place four or five or six years ago, I more particularly at that time looked at the state of the importations *viâ* Bristol and *viâ* the port with which I am more particularly connected, viz., Milford. The animals that were consigned through those ports came exclusively from Waterford and from Cork. I ascertained the arrangements; and my belief is that disease impregnated the lay fields into which the cattle are collected prior to exportation, less at Cork than at Waterford, in the spring; and when the store cattle came in large numbers, those fields became impregnated with disease until the autumn; and it appears to me that this is one chief cause of the spread of that disease which has done so much mischief in this country. The animals are purchased up-country by dealers, they are brought into the lay fields, and there they remain sometimes a night before they are embarked, and after that they are brought to to the open wharves and are then shipped. Of course, if disease exists before shipping, the vessels in which the animals are carried are likely to be infected, more particularly if they are vessels that carry passengers as well, in consequence of the great difficulty of disinfecting them.

7348. I understand you to say that you think the mixing of the cattle and passenger traffic is injurious to the proper carriage of animals?—In consequence of the state of things arising at Milford and at Bristol, I made it my business to visit several of the ports to which foreign cattle are imported.

7349. Was that recently?—It was about four years ago.

7350. What ports did you visit?—I went to Harwich, I went to Odam's Wharf in London, to Deptford, and I have since been to Southampton and Portsmouth. Some of the vessels that I saw, though not exclusively, were vessels which carried only cattle; and I saw the cattle taken out of those vessels, and they seemed to me to land in perfectly healthy and good condition. My own impression is that if animals are properly carried, with proper ventilation, proper space, and proper cleanliness, there is no reason why they should not be carried any distance by water. In fact, my theory is, whether right or wrong, that the laws which affect the

Chairman—continued.

carriage by sea of bipeds and of quadrupeds are very much the same. To conduct an emigration on a large scale, nothing is more necessary than to have a suitable depôt where proper arrangements can be made preparatory to the voyage. I believe that the same thing is necessary with reference to stock. Instead of having a lay field, I should have a waterside depôt, which can be properly cleansed and disinfected, where the animals could be received, inspected, refreshed, and embarked cool. That is a matter of great importance, because if animals are brought a long distance by road or rail before embarkation, and in a state of great heat and exhaustion, and are placed hurriedly on boardship, and if it should afterwards come on to blow, and the vessel's hatches had to be closed, of course from the bad gases which are generated, the animals must suffer to a degree that necessitates the engendering of disease, and that disease, when once engendered, must be continued. I also think that it is very difficult to construct a vessel to carry well both passengers and cattle, and, although I have inspected several, I have never yet been able to see a good cattle boat so constructed that it carries passengers and cattle comfortably and healthily. The cleansing of a cattle-boat (when carrying passengers) is excessively difficult. If cattle are not berthed above the waterline, water cannot be used, and I do not see how it is possible to cleanse a cattle-boat properly without the use of water. Some of the best boats for carrying cattle and passengers are the boats of the London and North Western Company, and great expense has been incurred on those vessels, and great care has been used in cleansing them. Captain Dent, their naval inspector, in his wisdom (and I think rightly), did not use water for a long time, but only scraped the lower decks; but he has been obliged to use water. The necessity of using water in the lower decks, of course, makes those decks very damp, and the heat of the animals generates bad air, and great mischief ensues.

7351. Then, do you think that a regulation which would make the carrying of cattle separate from that of passengers, so that animals were brought over in ships specially fitted for them, would improve the trade?—That is my impression. I have long felt that the first great improvement in the transit of stock between Ireland and England would be to get the animals collected before embarkation in a licensed depôt, and then, having had them properly inspected there, to convey them across in boats licensed for the purpose of the transit of cattle. That change is one which, I think, must be carefully made, and not immediately; and time should be given to persons to introduce that change; and stockowners will find that advantages will ensue from their animals being carried in a better manner. They will give a preference to the special cattle-boats. I cannot better illustrate my meaning than by stating what occurred with reference to the changes in the law as applicable to the transit of passengers by sea. When I was first apppointed an Emigration Commissioner in 1843, the advantages which were then insured to the emigrants were something like one pound of breadstuff a-day, one quart of water, and a small space to lie upon; but by inquiries by Parliamentary Committees, like the present Committee, that sat upon the working of the Passengers Act, recommendations were made, and changes

Chairman—continued.

changes of the law took place, and now the whole of the carrying trade of passengers is, I believe, conducted as efficiently as it is possible for it to be. My notion would be that an inquiry like the present would lead to recommendations being made as to a change in the law with regard to the transit of animals.

7352. I suppose that it would be necessary to enforce a rigid inspection, both of the depôts where the animals were stored and of the vessels themselves?—I think that the more rigid the inspection the better, but it must be in England as well as in Ireland. The better the service is performed the better it is for all interested. The live stock-boat rates, Ireland to England, are comparatively high (*vide Appendix*).

7353. And the service would be remunerative from the better condition in which the animals would be brought over?—That is my opinion. Formerly the trade in cattle from Ireland was comparatively small; but now it is very large, and increasing, and I think it must be highly remunerative.

7354. And, carried as they are at present, the cattle are not shipped in the best way for bringing them over, and that increases materially the discomfort of the passengers who are bound to be brought over with them?—The companionship at sea of live stock, particularly pigs, of course is very inconvenient; but I do not suppose that you would desire me to go into that point, as this inquiry is specially with reference to the treatment of cattle. With reference to the treatment of the cattle only, my conviction is that the better the animal is treated the better it is for the breeder and for the buyer and consumer on this side. There is now a want of confidence in those cattle that come from Ireland, and I believe that that want of confidence must affect the price. Therefore the Irish would be themselves desirous that the arrangements should be the best that could possibly be made. I know, as a fact, that there are many Irish breeders who come over themselves with their cattle, and they have found it necessary in order to see that they get proper treatment.

7355. Have you, in these inquiries, turned your attention at all to the possibility of creating a dead-meat trade, or of bringing over provisions as dead meat instead of as live animals from Ireland?—Yes, in connection with a matter which perhaps the Committee will permit me to mention. During the sitting of the Committee, of which the Right honourable Member for Bradford, I think, was Chairman, I represented to Sir Stafford Northcote that I thought that most of the disease entered the country, not so much from abroad as from the bad treatment of the Irish stock, and he mentioned that matter to the Duke of Buckingham. I did not hear what passed, but, in the autumn of 1875, I again reminded Sir Stafford Northcote of my opinion, and he told me that he recollected the circumstance perfectly, and that he should be much obliged to me if I would communicate my views to the Privy Council. I did so; I saw Mr. Peel, and I also saw the Duke of Richmond; and, in consequence of the communications which then passed, I under took to go to Ireland to see whether any arrangements could be made to improve at the two ports with which I am connected, viz., Waterford and Cork, the preparations for the voyage; and I also undertook to produce a scheme by which I thought the general arrange-

Chairman—continued.

Sir *C. A. Wood.* 25 June 1877.

ments for the transit of stock between England and Ireland could be safely carried out. First of all, I communicated with the Cork Steamship Company, and they readily came into the arrangement. Their depôt was a very good one; some improvements which I suggested were carried out, and, I think, the arrangements, so far as I know, of the Cork Steamship Company were, and are, exceedingly good. At Waterford I was in this difficulty: the trade of Waterford is a trade to the extent of 45,000 or 46,000 head of cattle in the year besides sheep and pigs; the cattle are all embarked, with the exception of those that are carried by the Great Western Railway, and which form only about one-tenth of the whole, from an open wharf, on the southern side of the river; it would have been impossible therefore for me to have arranged anything on the south side, but I did make provisional arrangements for the acquisition of a site for a depôt on the north side. I have had plans formed of those depôts both for Cork and for Waterford, and I also made arrangements for providing a depôt for the port of Bristol. The arrangements at Milford, I believe, are sufficiently good. Those that were to be made at Bristol contemplated the formation of a large depôt at Portishead, and the reason why Portishead was selected was this: that by the extension of a wharf at Portishead the cattle-boats might come alongside at any time of the tide. From inquires which I made I learnt that the cattle became injuriously affected almost as soon as the vessels came to an anchor in King's Roads. As long as the vessels bringing the cattle were pursuing their voyage the cattle remained tolerably healthy; but immediately they stopped to wait for the tide, or to get into the Avon, they then became, from want of air, very much injured; and, it was on that account, that Portishead was selected. If it is the desire of the Committee to see those plans they are here in the room, and they can be shown.

7356. I understand that this is a scheme that was submitted to the Privy Council?—It is.

7357. And the object of that scheme was to endeavour to develop this trade?—It was.

7358. Under that scheme has anything yet been done?—Nothing has been done. It was submitted as the best that I could design; it contemplated the formation of a depôt, and the arrangements which would be necessary on both sides.

7359. Under that scheme, with proper inspection and proper regulations, you believe that a large trade might be carried on between Ireland and this country?—I think so; and with less risk of disease than at present.

7360. Has your attention been directed to the possibility of dead meat being imported?—It has. The depôts are so arranged as to provide for the separation of the healthy and unhealthy, and animals in contact with the latter.

7361. Will you state to the Committee the circumstances under which your attention was directed to that subject?—A change of trade so great as that of carrying meat by carcase is one that involves many changes, particularly to a railway company; but the one with which I am particularly connected owns one-half of the underground of Smithfield Market, and it has always looked as the trade extended in that direction, to make these arrangements perfect. I believe that there is not the slightest difficulty in

Sir C. A Wood.

25 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

delivering any quantity of meat through this market.

7362. Do you believe that even during the hot weather a dead-meat trade could be carried by the railway companies, and distributed by the railway companies?—Certainly, by vans which are fitted for that purpose.

7363. We have had evidence before the Committee of the possibility of bringing over dead meat to this country in cool chambers as is done with the American supply; but the difficulty which has been suggested has always been, that when it did arrive here it had to be distributed amongst the small towns of the country, and that it was subject to atmospheric influence as soon as it left the steamer, and that consequently it deteriorated very much; has your attention been called to that?—Yes; in 1871 I employed a person who is the manager of the Piston Freezing Company, in London (Mr. Ash) to design, and he did patent, a cooled van. I believe Mr. Ash to be the inventor of the cold-air process by which meat is preserved. The patent for which Mr. Lake, the American, is registered, was only taken out in January of the present year. Here is Mr. Ash's Patent, dated 5th May 1871, of a cooled van (*producing a drawing*). That has been tried, and it answers; there have since been improvements made upon that with regard to small vehicles, by which meat can be brought from Deptford, for instance.

7364. Your attention has been called to the carrying of the dead meat from Deptford Market, with a view of bringing it under better conditions into the Smithfield Market or into the country markets?—Yes, we have a vehicle now being constructed for that purpose. There is a very large meat trade from the West of England, and some of it is conveyed to London on the broad gauge; the communication between Paddington and Smithfield is on the narrow gauge, and consequently, when this meat is brought to Paddington, it has to be transferred into delivering waggons; and the result is not quite successful. It comes up from the West of England suspended in meat vans; it has then to be taken out at Paddington, and it is put into vehicles and carted into the City, which is not a good arrangement. To get over that, it has occurred to us recently, that vehicles might be made, which could be put on broad gauge trucks in the West of England; they will be brought to Paddington, and then from Paddington they can be horsed to the Metropolitan Meat Market.

7365. And you believe that it will be quite possible to carry out a system, by which vans may take the meat from the steamers, be placed upon the railroad, and then be taken by road afterwards to any town or depôt where the meat is wanted?—I think so, without any difficulty.

7366. Maintaining, by the process which you have described as applied to this van, the cool atmosphere in which the meat has been brought across?—Yes; I consider Mr. Ash's process to have been extremely valuable with reference to getting over the great difficulty of admitting air and excluding dust. This he effects by the use of wool.

7367. Do you not want in the van the ice which seems to be required in some of the processes?—There is no difficulty in getting ice anywhere, and I think that it is essential to have ice. The cold air is forced through ice. The van

Chairman—continued.

that we are now making is a road vehicle, and the air will pass into that vehicle through ice. But it is only for a very short time in the year that ice will be required. We have been supplying for several years Merthyr Tydfil, in South Wales, with merino sheep imported regularly every week to Deptford. These merino sheep formerly were carried alive, but since the restrictions they are conveyed in carcase, and until lately there has been no difficulty at all. In this very hot weather it is possible that there may have been difficulty, but that is for a very short time in the year.

7368. I understand you to say that this van is not in working order yet?—It is not finished yet, but we are very confident that it will work satisfactorily in the hottest weather.

7369. You are not speaking of the sheep having been carried to Merthyr Tydfil under those favourable circumstances, are you?—No; the carcases have been carried in ordinary trucks.

7370. Have they been packed in any particular way, so as to prevent the carriage being injurious to them?—I am not quite sure how that is.

7371. But there has, up to the recent hot weather, been a constant carriage of dead meat from Deptford into Merthyr Tydfil?—Yes, with a view to its consumption in that locality.

7372. With regard to the carriage of dead meat, has it been attended with any loss to the trade from the sheep having been killed at Deptford?—No; I have not heard of any. When I looked into this matter some years ago I learned that meat killed in Scotland at a higher latitude will keep two days longer than meat which is killed in London; I then thought that if that was sound for Aberdeen beef it must apply to Ireland, because there was the intermediate operation of the sea-passage.

7373. As to the carriage of dead meat, how are the carcases got from Deptford to the Great Western Railway at present, because I understand you to say that your vans are not yet running?—They are not. We have a contractor who delivers at Smithfield all our meat from Paddington which comes up by the broad gauge, and the same person brings it from Deptford to us.

7374. Therefore the animals, after being slaughtered at Deptford, are carried in carts until they perform their journey down into Wales?—That is so. There is no physical connection at present with any railway at Deptford.

7375. Therefore you say that you have delivered without any considerable loss, for some little time, this dead meat after it has gone through not only the railway journey, but also the journey by cart between Deptford and your stations?—Yes; but we do not consider that that is a perfect arrangement.

7376. You would represent that under the probability of the continuance of such a trade, vans, such as you have described, might be adopted, which would render it a certainty?—We believe so. One truck filled with fat cattle contains eight animals; that is 32 quarters; and this vehicle that is being constructed is being made to hold 32 quarters. As regards other changes, we are rather waiting to see what is the result of this Committee; we hope to get some information from it.

7377. Still I understand you to say that you have yourself been experimenting in this direction for some time?—For a long time.

7378. And

Chairman—continued.

7378. And you see no reason from the results of those experiments to doubt the possibility, not only of carrying meat properly frem Ireland, but of carrying the dead meat which has been brought into this country in a cool atmosphere throughout the country and distributing it to the various towns?—I see no reason to doubt it. I was one of the committee, with some members of the Corporation, which constructed the Meat Market, and I believe the market capable of great extension, and that the arches upon which it is built are capable of being converted into cold stores or larders.

7379. In fact this system of cooling the air applied to permanent depôts or stores would carry out the cool air process generally, so that you might keep for a long period the meat that was sent over dead either from Ireland or from the Continent?—From anywhere.

7380. You have heard, no doubt, of the practical possibility of making ice artificially during a period of the year when you were not so well able to get natural ice?—Stores of ice may exist everywhere. At Waterford, for instance, the importation of ice is a regular trade. I heard Mr. Denny's name mentioned here by one of the witnesses this morning; they kill 300 bacon pigs a day through the hot summer, and that business is facilitated by the use of ice to cool the buildings.

7381. That is a trade which is going on now?—Yes, to a very great extent. It is a very profitable trade. There was formerly, I believe, a very large meat trade at Cork, but it paid the Irish better, I believe, to send stores, than to send fat cattle, and that trade has for a time ceased. I am not at all sure that from the South of Ireland there will even be a very large exportation of fat animals, because the trade of the South of Ireland is so highly remunerative for breeding, and they do breed, beautiful store cattle. I imagine that there is no part of the United Kingdom in which there are finer store cattle to be met with than in the South of Ireland, and I think that it pays them better to send over stores than to send fat cattle.

7382. With regard to store cattle, you suggest that regulations should be made for inspection at the ports, and for their transit in properly constructed steamers?—Yes, there should be regulations for inspection at the port, and for their transit in proper steamers.

7383. And you think that it would be quite possible to carry the dead meat in the way that you have described?—Certainly. Now fish is a more perishable article than meat; and here are the arrangements by which the mackerel trade is carried on, which is a trade which pays between 22,000 *l.* and 25,000 *l.* a year in railway charges. That mackerel traffic is quite a new trade.

7384. Is it brought by railroad?—It is all brought by railroad from Milford.

7385. From whence?—From Kinsale, chiefly; the system is this: in the month of March there collect about Kinsale fishermen from all parts, upwards of 200 sail of fishing boats; and there are steamers which are sent from the Mersey, and those steamers lie at Kinsale, and the fish are brought in there iced, and they are sent off to Milford. On arriving at Milford the whole is distributed over the country, not to England only, but even to the Continent; and, according to the demand of that day, so is the number of boxes sent. I believe that the same system would apply to meat. I have here the arrangements and rates.

Chairman—continued.

7386. That applies to fresh mackerel?—Yes, that applies to fresh mackerel.

7387. And, by making the requisite arrangements, they send the amount that is required for the market?—Yes, to all these places according to these rates.

7388. Will you hand in that paper?—Yes. (*The same was handed in.*)

7389. That would show the feasibility of a similar trade in dead meat being established?—Yes. That is quite a new trade. In 1876 there were 91,352 boxes, weighing 8,758 tons, and the transit charges for those were 22,290 *l.* This year it has increased; between the 28th of March and the 20th of June there were brought to Milford 95,812 boxes, which weighed 9,253 tons, and the total charge for which was 25,261 *l.*; so that it is a very large trade.

7390. Are those boxes carried in vans prepared for them?—Yes; they are open vans, but rather high-sided; and it is a very nice operation, in a short time, to get the boxes all properly distributed, because the buyers will want so many boxes to go to one place, and so many to another.

7391. They have to be like letters sorted out at your stations?—Exactly.

7392. You give that evidence to show that the trade already exists with regard to a very perishable article, namely, fish, and that therefore under the conditions which you have suggested it would be quite possible to carry out that trade in dead meat, distributing it as you do fish, to different parts of England along the lines of railroad?—Yes, I think the interior of the country may be supplied from great centres, such as Bristol, Birmingham, and Liverpool, in addition to all metropolitan markets. The cattle would come to the same ports where these meat places would be.

7393. Is there anything else which you would wish to put in in your examination in chief?—I should like to put in the plan of the depôt which I submitted last year to the Privy Council. This plan shows the depôt at Waterford and the depôt at Portishead (*producing a Plan and describing it to the Committee*).

7394. There you have, I see, not only sheds for slaughtering the cattle, but quarantine sheds?—Yes.

7395. That paper which you have in your hand explains fully, does it not, the whole operation of dealing with the cattle on their embarkation and arrival?—It does.

7396. Will you hand that in?—Yes (*the same was handed in,* see *Appendix*).

Mr. *W. E. Forster.*

7397. This plan that you suggest is not in operation anywhere, is it?—The Cork Steam Ship Company partly adopted the suggestion, and so far it is in operation there. Sir John Arnott, the chairman, agreed that it was a sound system, and some improvements were made in their depôt, and their depôt I consider to be an extremely good one.

7398. Have you lately been to Ireland?—I was there about a month ago.

7399. I suppose you would say that in Cork the arrangements are a good deal improved?—I think so.

7400. Do you think that they are improved at Waterford?

Sir *C. A. Wood.*

25 June 1877.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

Waterford?—I have reason to know from a communication with Mr. Moon, the chairman of the London and North Western Railway, that great improvements have been made by that Company in Dublin.

7401. Do you think that the arrangements are improved at Waterford?—I am afraid not.

7402. With regard to the treatment of the animals, has it come before you that the animals are hardly treated in getting them into the vessels?—Yes, the usage of the animals is very bad; I cannot use words that would convey what I really do feel about the treatment of the animals.

7403. Do you allude to the treatment of the animals by the drovers before they are embarked?—In the act of embarkation; and also on this side, to get them into the railway trucks, when they are, as is too often the case, exhausted.

7404. I suppose they use cruelty in forcing them on board?—Yes, in forcing them on board.

7405. I think I heard you state that you had seen great cruelty with regard to pigs?—With regard to pigs especially. At Cork, at the premises of the Cork Steam Ship Company, more care is observed; but at Waterford, I have seen great cruelty. I have seen the men engaged in forcing them on board applying their sticks to those tender parts of the animal which would not injure the flesh, such as the eye and the mouth.

7406. You are probably aware that in consequence of the report of the Select Committee of 1873, Government inspectors were ordered to go to the ports of landing of the Irish cattle, and to ascertain whether they had been properly treated on the voyage as regards food, water, &c.?—There are inspectors now. There is an inspector at Milford, and the work is very well done. There are inspectors at the Irish ports, but I do not think it possible for an inspector to make any proper inspection of the animals at an open wharf.

7407. Do you think that that inspection has done anything towards diminishing the cruelty?—The cruelty is almost inherent in the system. If I might make a suggestion with regard to this, I think it it would certainly be a good arrangement as far as the protection of the animals was concerned, if all these men were licensed. In the passenger trade the emigrant runners are now all licensed.

7408. You mean that the drovers should be licensed?—I think that the drovers' men should be licensed by the local authorities. It is a means of getting hold of a man, and, of course, if he commits an act of brutality his license may be forfeited.

7409. In England, as you are aware from your connection with the Great Western Railway, there are regulations with regard to the transit of cattle, and the inspectors from the Veterinary Department go over England to see how those regulations are carried out; are you aware whether there is anything similar to that in Ireland?—I do not think that there are travelling inspectors in Ireland; I believe that in Ireland the inspectors are local. But in England they are under this difficulty: the inspectors can regulate the loading pens, but between the loading pens and the water's edge there are intervals over which they have no control.

7410. You know that it is not many years since the regulations were made in England for furnishing every railway station with water; I suppose that has had a good effect, has it not?—Yes.

7411. Returning to the question of disease, I gather that you are not at all surprised to find that animals arrive with foot-and-mouth disease from Ireland?—No, not at all.

7412. And until these improvements, which you suggest, are made, you fully expect that that disease will continue?—I lived for 12 years in a county adjoining the county of Monmouth, where disease existed to a great extent in the county of Brecon, which also is a breeding county, and I foretold what would happen; and I believe that those two counties have suffered very much from foot-and-mouth disease brought *viâ* Newport and Milford.

7413. You are aware, I suppose, that in consequence very much of the regulations passed by the Privy Council, the cattle ships from the Continent are forced to comply with certain rules with regard to the mode in which the cattle are shipped and taken care of?—Yes.

7414. Does the same thing exist with regard to Ireland?—No.

7415. You come before us with information derived from different sources, from having studied passenger ships and the arrangements with regard to emigration, and from having given very careful attention to the Irish cattle trade, and having to some extent inspected the mode of carrying on the Continental trade; comparing the Continental cattle trade, especially into the port of London, with the Irish cattle trade to the Western parts of England, is there the same care taken to prevent disease with the Irish trade as there is with the Continental trade?—I think not, decidedly.

7416. Nor the same care for the treatment of the animals?—Certainly not.

7417. Have you seen anything of the animals that arrive at Portsmouth from Spain and Portugal?—Yes, I have seen a cargo at Portsmouth in excellent condition.

7418. We are informed that great care is taken in the transit of those animals?—Yes; I saw last year a cargo just landed, and they could not be in a better state.

7419. When you come to disinfecting, do you think that there is as much endeavour made to disinfect the Irish ships from the disease as there is to disinfect the Continental ships?—That I am unable to say.

7420. I understand you to say that you think that more care ought to be taken with regard to the Irish ships?—Yes, I certainly think that there ought to be more care taken.

7421. Am I right in considering that the greatest danger from infection is, that they get thoroughly infected before they leave Ireland?—Yes; in the lay fields or open wharves.

7422. And therefore the suggestion which you have made is, that there should be greater care taken with regard to the ship before it left the port?—I think so, but more particularly of the animals before shipment.

7423. You are aware, I suppose, that foot-and-mouth disease develops rather quickly?—I have read the evidence to that effect.

7424. There is this difference between foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia; that pleuro-pneumonia may lie for a long time in an animal

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

animal, and foot-and-mouth disease will manifest itself more quickly?—Yes, so I understand.

7425. That would lead us to think, would it not, that proper regulations with regard to the inspection before they leave Ireland would be a very considerable security with regard to foot-and-mouth disease?—And also inspection after arrival at the waterside in England.

7426. Your saying that there ought to be inspection on landing in England, rather points to your limiting the number of ports to which Irish cattle could come, does is not?—I think that the trade has limited the number of ports. For instance, the South of Ireland sends to Liverpool for some of the Northern markets, and it sends to Bristol for the Thursday's market at Bristol, and it sends to Milford for Newport, and for the Gloucester Market. All those markets are on particular days. The first market in England towards Ireland is Newport on the Wednesday; the Bristol Market is on Thursday, and there is at Gloucester on Saturday a special Irish Market, there being on Monday an English Market for English stock. I think what has been done at Gloucester might be well followed elsewhere, especially at Bristol.

7427. You spoke of your connection with the Great Western and the Great Western ships; do those Great Western ships carry cattle?—The Great Western daily ships, tentatively, do not carry cattle. We have three vessels which run daily between Waterford and Milford and Milford and Waterford, making six voyages a week each way. Those voyages are performed with perfect regularity, with as much regularity as the voyages between Holyhead and Kingstown, and my board tentatively has for twelve months been carrying no cattle in those boats. They are vessels of high speed. I believe that that arrangement is still tentative, but the difficulty, of course, is to obtain for these vessels a sufficient cargo to make that description of traffic remunerative. It is hoped that it will be supplemented by perishables, such as fish, meat, poultry, and fresh butter.

7428. Have your company thought it worth while to start cattle steamers?—Yes; we have two cattle-boats that carry nothing else but cattle.

7429. Where do they come to?—They run between Milford and Waterford, and those vessels, I believe, will pay. The London and North Western Company have two vessels lately constructed; they are fine vessels, the "Rose" and the "Shamrock," which make passages now between the North Wall and Holyhead, carrying only first and second class passengers and no cattle.

7430. With regard to the condition of the cattle before they leave Ireland, is the length of the journey that they generally have before they get to the port of embarkation within your knowledge?—That will vary according to the position. The cattle that come to the port of Waterford are brought long distances by railway. The communication with the port of Waterford may easily be seen extending up to the extreme west. Our connections go as far as Tuam, and all through the intervening country.

7431. Has your company anything to do with those railways?—Up to Tuam it has. (*The Witness described the Map to the Committee.*)

7432. What is generally done with the beast between the time of his being taken out of the railway car and his being put on board the steamer?—Taken into lay fields; those that come in from up-country generally come into the lay fields.

7433. I gather that, if we want to stop foot-and-mouth disease in England, the mere prohibition of live animals coming from the Continent, without doing something with regard to this Irish trade, would be of no use whatever?—Not the least, in my opinion.

7434. Returning to the dead-meat market at Deptford, would it not be an immense convenience for distributing the dead meat throughout England and throughout the metropolis if there was a railroad from the Deptford Market competing with the Underground Railroad?—There is a railroad very near it, the East London, which is worked by the London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Company; and that railway either has, or, I believe, is to have, a connection which might enable it to work on to the Metropolitan Meat Market.

7435. What would be the length of railroad that would be required to put the Deptford Market upon the railway system?—The East London goes under the Thames; it is the old Thames Tunnel which is converted into a railroad, and is worked by the Brighton Company, and it goes within, I think, half a mile of the Deptford Market. This is a plan of the Metropolitan Meat Market (*producing a Plan and describing it to the Committee*). There are six lifts, 10 feet square, so that they will take a whole side of meat. This market is capable of enormous extension, because each of these arches contains 600 feet of area; and the meat may be worked either from above and downwards, or it need not go into the market at all, because the Great Western Company pay market dues, and, therefore, meat which came in by rail might immediately pass out again by this circular road, without being sent up by the lifts.

7436. I have heard it stated by those who are conversant with the trade, that it is natural to expect that there would be less care for the comfort of the animal and less care to prevent the ill-treatment of the animal in the case of store cattle than in the case of fat cattle, because it is said that the store cattle may recover, whereas the fat beast does not sell for so much if it is ill-used; is that true, according to your experience?—Certainly.

7437. Therefore if we look at our duty in reference to our treatment of the animals, greater care is required with regard to this store cattle trade than would be required with regard to the fat cattle?—I think so. My impression as I have already stated, is that the disease is spread in consequence of the large introduction of store cattle. When the cattle came formerly they were killed, and you heard no more of them. Now they go through the country; the bulk of the cattle that we bring *viâ* Bristol and Reading goes to Kent, some goes to Shrewsbury, some to the east, to Norfolk; others that are carried by the Waterford Steam-ship Company are taken to Liverpool, and from Liverpool to various northern markets.

7438. In fact there would be a very considerable store cattle trade between places so remote as the counties of Galway and Norfolk?—Certainly. There is a very large sheep trade out of Clare.

Sir *C. A. Wood.*

25 June 1877.

Sir *C. A. Wood.*

25 June 1877.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

7439. And that is a trade that no increase of the dead-meat traffic will be likely to stop?—Not the least in the world.

7440. And therefore the dead-meat import would not stop the danger of disease from that trade, unless care be taken to prevent it?—There is great alarm in Ireland at the present time about the American meat, and the effect upon the price of Irish meat. I own myself that I do not share that apprehension. My belief is, that the effect of the introduction of American meat, will be to lead to the introduction of carrying the meat from Ireland, instead of the live animals, and that the breeders and feeders of Ireland will get the full value of their animals which they have never hitherto enjoyed. In consequence of the bad treatment, the necessarily bad treatment in transit of the live fat animals, the Irish proprietor has never obtained the full value of his animal.

7441. It is of course easier to carry the store animal than to carry the fat animal?—Certainly. I believe it difficult to carry perfectly by rail and by ship a fat animal. For instance, supposing you have eight fat animals wedged in a railway-truck, you may send from 15 to 20, or a less number, trucks of those to the London Market from Milford Haven; there will be occasions when the trucks must be shunted to allow the passenger-trains to pass, and every shunting causes a pressure upon the prime parts of the animal, and consequently that pressure to a certain extent bruises the fat animal. If a shunt takes place and the weight of eight animals in a truck is brought together, it necessarily compresses the animal at the part that is most valuable.

7442. I think that we may rather gather from your evidence, that although the Irish trade still wants improvement, yet you are of opinion that there have been considerable improvements within the last ten years?—Decidedly so, very considerable. I think that as much has been done as could reasonably be expected; but still, not all that is required with reference to safety.

Mr. *French*.

7443. You mentioned that you went to inspect these ports in Ireland; in what year was that?—I first made an inspection in the autumn of 1864; I went again in 1866, and I have been backwards and forwards from Ireland every year since.

7444. Have you gone round to the ports since then?—No, I have not. I have been to Dublin and Belfast since, and also to Waterford and Cork repeatedly.

7445. At those ports which you have gone to latterly, have you found a very great improvement since that time?—I have stated that there has been an improvement. The London and North Western premises are now exceedingly good. The City of Cork Company's premises at the North Wall are very good. At Waterford it is an open wharf, and therefore there are no premises except a small depôt which the Great Western Company use.

7446. It is in contemplation at the present time in Waterford, is it not, to build sheds similar to those at Cork?—I am not aware I think that to carry on a large trade in live animals, the only way of getting rid of the layfields, which I consider to be the great propagators of disease, is to work through a depôt at the water-side,

Mr. *French*—continued.

which can be properly cleansed, and where there can be separation.

7447. Did I correctly understand you to say that the drovers of Waterford were licensed?—No; I wish they were. I think that the licensing of drovers would be a great improvement.

7448. Are you aware of any place where they are licensed?—In London they are, and ought to be so everywhere.

7449. You say that the Great Western Company have two ships engaged solely in the cattle trade with Waterford?—Yes, the "Malakhoff," and the "Vulture." They are used exclusively for cattle.

7450. Will you describe those ships?—They are fitted for cattle. The "Vulture," has this advantage; that is to say, the animals are shipped above the water-line. I believe that if you put animals down in the hold of a vessel it is very difficult to cleanse the vessel properly.

7451. If you put the cattle above the water-line, you must have the hold empty, must you not?—That, of course, is a difficulty, but still the trade is so large, and the continental trade being conducted by many vessels which carry only cattle in a different way, I think that the Irish is a trade that would pay to do well, and I believe that the best way to do it is to use these cattle-boats backwards and forwards. But you cannot do that unless there are depôts.

7452. Could you tell the Committee what steps are taken with regard to disinfecting these boats on disembarking a cargo of cattle?—The Privy Council have laid down certain regulations about the introduction of water, and then lime whitening afterwards.

7453. You think that the introduction of water to vessels where cattle were stowed below the water-line, would be impracticable?—It would be impossible to put a quantity of water between the decks of a vessel without making them damp; and if you put in the animals afterwards, where there is heat, it draws out vapours, and all that is prejudicial to the health of the cattle.

7454. Have you gone much on the farms in Ireland?—I know Tipperary and Kilkenny, and all the best grazing parts; they are the finest in the United Kingdom, I believe,

7455. Have you been there lately?—Yes, I was there about a month ago.

7456. Is it a fact that Ireland is now free from foot-and-mouth disease?—The stock looked very healthy when I was there, as they generally do. I believe that there are no stock healthier than the Irish cattle.

7457. Do you know whether there was any foot-and-mouth disease in the country last year?—I was not there long enough to make a personal inspection.

7458. Did you see any of it at the ports?—I did not hear of any. The cattle trade had hardly commenced when I was there last.

7459. Do you think that Ireland is more liable to foot-and-mouth disease than England?—Certainly not; as I have already stated, I believe they are very healthy stock.

7460. I understood you to say a few minutes ago that you thought that most of the foot-and-mouth disease along the west coast of England came from Ireland?—My answer was with reference to the treatment of the animals in transit. How it comes I cannot say; whether it is in the boats

Mr. *French*—continued.

boats, and remains there, I do not know; but such is the fact.

7461. Do you think that the Privy Council regulations are, as a rule, strictly carried out, with regard to disinfecting those boats?—It is very difficult for me to say. I hardly know who has the control of the boats. I cannot answer that question. I can only speak as to the results.

7462. Do you not think that if those boats were made much better than they are, and made solely for the purpose of the transit of cattle, there would be very little foot-and-mouth disease?—I do not believe that there would be the slightest difficulty in moving cattle; cattle may be moved with perfect safety.

7463. You think that if there were certain improvements in the present mode of shipping transit, there would be very little danger of foot-and-mouth disease being introduced into England from Ireland?—There would be no difficulty with proper regulations.

7464. With regard to fat animals, you say, that every shifting of the waggons on the lines, creates a bruising of the animals; is not that more or less the fault of the railway companies?—No, I do not think that it would be possible to avoid that. The trucks are made with proper spring buffers, and everything is done that can be done to ease cattle trains by bringing them up slowly; but still in the transit those collisions will sometimes occur.

7465. Are all the cattle waggons on the railways in the United Kingdom provided with spring buffers?—I believe so; they get them as good as they can possibly be.

Sir *George Jenkinson.*

7466. I think you spoke of the cattle traffic chiefly from Waterford to Bristol; is there not also a considerable traffic between Cork and Bristol?—Yes, very large indeed; but I do not see so much of that.

7467. Are they chiefly store cattle, or fat cattle?—I think stores chiefly.

7468. And there are separate vessels for cattle on that line that you have spoken of between the North Wall and Holyhead?—No, they are for cattle and passengers also.

7469. You think that it would be one of the main improvements in the transit of cattle if you were to have the passengers and cattle in separate boats?—That is my opinion. We are not here, I suppose, to consider the comfort of passengers, but I have travelled in the cattle-boats, and a pig at sea is a bad companion.

7470. I think that you have expressed an opinion which I have heard expressed before, viz., that although stock may be very healthy in Ireland when brought for embarkation they contract disease *in transitu* on board?—That is my impression; I do not know how otherwise they get it.

Colonel *Kingscote.*

7471. I conclude that as a means of earning a dividend for your railway, you would sooner carry live stock than you would carry deat meat?—Carrying by boat and railway we would rather carry dead meat; in fact, the rate, of course, is so very much better. Take, for instance, eight cattle carried from Waterford to London; the rate for the eight animals alive would be 6 *l.*; the rate for those eight animals in carcases would come to something like 11 *l.* 10 *s.*; and of course we should prefer carrying the meat at the higher rate.

Colonel *Kingscote*—continued.

7472. You did not finish a sentence in answer to an honourable Member, about the market at Gloucester. I think you said that what was done at Gloucester about Irish cattle you would like to see in operation at other markets; what is done at Gloucester?—At Gloucester the Saturday's market is now given up exclusively to Irish cattle. The stock on Saturday is the surplus stock not sold at Bristol on the Thursday previous, and such additional stock as comes *viâ* Milford.

7473. What is the difference between the two?—I do not see why arrangements should not be made with the railway companies to send from market to market. Supposing that the depôt system were carried out, and that on landing the rate was made through from Waterford to Gloucester, from Gloucester to Banbury, and from Banbury to other places, I do not see why a system might not be adopted by which you could not take the animals through from market to market when they would not be mixed up with the cattle of the country, and I think that that perhaps would give additional confidence. What you want with regard to the Irish stock is confidence.

7474. You said that you lived in Breconshire for some time, did you not?—Yes; for 12 years.

7475. I have before me a return from the chief-constable of Monmouthshire, in which he says that in the year 1876 there were 2,114 holdings in the county of Monmouth that were infected with foot-and-mouth disease out of 4,681; what do you think is the source of that disease?—In the adjoining county, Breconshire, where I resided, it was very much the same. We believed that it came from Newport.

7476. By cattle from Ireland?—Yes, passed up through the country.

7477. As regards the cattle that came over in your boats, I believe you charge 1 *s.* insurance, do you not, for every head of stock that comes over?—Yes, there is an insurance fund now; they do pay insurance.

7478. If in the year 1876 one man who imported 1,500 head of cattle was paid by the company over 100 *l.* for cattle lost, do you think that it would be a large proportion?—Very few valuable cattle run up to that amount of money.

7479. If those were common stock, you do not believe that that is an exaggeration?—I do not think that it would be.

7480. Do you think it would be an exaggeration if the same person said that from injury to cattle, for which he receives nothing from the company, he had certainly lost 400 *l.* or 500 *l.* from the animals being so knocked about that he had had to turn them out to get them well again before he could put them into the market?—That shows that there must be something wrong; that is a large sum. I suppose you allude to a man of the name of Stratton. He is a large buyer, and he buys valuable stock. I do not know that it would be an exaggeration, but good animals are, no doubt, injured in coming over, even when every care is taken.

Sir *C. A. Wood.*

25 June 1877.

Sir *C. A. Wood.*

25 June 1877.

Mr. *Arthur Peel.*

7481. Are there any boats engaged in the cattle traffic between Ireland and this country independent of the railway companies?—Yes. There is the Dundalk Company, who are very large carriers, and Burns and M'Iver; and then south, there is the Waterford Steamship Company, the Cork Steamship Company, the City of Dublin Steamship Company, and another company, the name of which I forget at present.

7482. All the cattle boats, unless I am misinformed, that come to Holyhead are the property of the London and North Western Railway Company?—All that come to Holyhead are the property of the London and North Western Railway Company; they are very fine boats. The Lancashire and Yorkshire boats are also very large and powerful boats. I think the "Alexander Dugdale" is the finest boat I have seen.

7483. The railway companies have not got the traffic under their own control, and we cannot look to them for full and entire control of the traffic at the port of departure?—No.

7484. What proportion of the cattle come by the railway boats?—The London and North Western Company carry the bulk of the Dublin cattle, but I am hardly prepared to state the proportion.

7485. Is there any means of getting at it?—Yes. I have no doubt that we could get it if the Committee desire it. The City of Cork Company bring all the cattle from Cork; and the Waterford Steamship Company the greater part from Waterford. The proportion of the Great Western is very small; of the 45,000 or 46,000 a year, of cattle. But of the pigs we carry half, though not so many of the sheep. The number last year, at Waterford, of pigs were 75,891, and of sheep, 62,949. We carry perhaps one-tenth.

Mr. *Arthur Peel*—continued.

Major *Allen.*

7486. Is the dead-meat trade from Cornwall an increasing trade?—Yes; I am not sure whether it has extended so much into Cornwall, but the dead meat is becoming a staple trade, with special local arrangements, like any other trade. At, for instance, Barnstaple, there is a large abattoir, and the farmers, instead of sending their beasts into the market send them into the Barnstaple abattoir, where they are killed, and the railway company takes possession of them, and they are sent to the Metropolitan Market; and it is so at Taunton and other large towns.

7487. I understand that at Lostwithiel and St. Austell the trade is very much increasing, and I know myself that at Lostwithiel there is a small population; the argument has been that the live animals should be imported because they can dispose of the offal; now, at Lostwithiel, where there is a small population, that could not be done?—The butcher always likes the live animal; the fifth quarter is never accounted for.

Wednesday, 27th June 1877.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Major Allen.
Mr. Anderson.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. Chaplin.
Mr. Dease.
Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.
Mr. Elliot.
Mr. W. E. Forster.
Mr. John Holms.
Mr. King-Harman.
Colonel Kingscote.
Mr. M'Lagan.
Mr. Mundella.
Mr. Norwood.
Mr. Pease.
Mr. Arthur Peel.
Sir Henry Selwin Ibbetson.
Mr. Torr.

SIR HENRY SELWIN IBBETSON, BART., IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. THOMAS JOHN LUYA, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

7488. I BELIEVE you are Chief Inspector of Meat under the Corporation of Liverpool?—I am.

7489. Have you been inspector of meat under the corporation for some time?—I have, for about four and a half years.

7490. Previously to that had you any knowledge of the cattle trade?—Yes; I was a butcher for about 20 years before that, on my own account, and a cattle-dealer.

7491. Therefore you, of course, have a practical knowledge both of the live and dead trade in cattle?—Yes.

7492. Are you the only inspector at the present moment?—No; there are three others, besides myself, under me.

7493. Are they all appointed by the corporation?—Yes.

7494. What amount of cattle come under your notice during a week, for instance?—About 1,500 a week, taking the borough of Liverpool altogether.

7495. Does that represent the amount that is slaughtered and consumed in Liverpool?—There are about 1,000, I think, slaughtered in Liverpool, as near as I can possibly tell.

7496. Those are slaughtered and consumed in the town itself?—Yes.

7497. Are those cattle only, or does that number include sheep?—It does not include sheep.

7498. The cattle market at Liverpool is the Stanley Market, is it not?—It is.

7499. Is that market within the boundaries of the borough?—It is in West Derby; it is out of the boundaries of Liverpool.

7500. Is it within the jurisdiction of the county magistrates or of the borough magistrates?—Of the county magistrates.

7501. Are they principally Irish animals that come into Liverpool, or do you have Scotch and foreign animals?—We have Portuguese, Spanish, Irish, and Scotch.

7502. What proportion do those animals bear to the total supply that comes to the Liverpool Cattle Market?—I have no means of ascertaining that.

Chairman—continued.

7503. But you state that cattle arrive in large numbers from Ireland, Scotland, Spain, Portugal, and America?—Yes.

7504. From your inspection have you had opportunities of seeing those different races of cattle?—I have.

7505. With regard to the Spanish and Portuguese cattle, can you speak as to the condition in which they arrive at the market?—Yes.

7506. In what condition do they arrive?—They generally arrive in a very healthy condition.

7507. And you have not had to condemn or to certify many of those cattle as suffering from disease?—No. When the cattle are landed in Liverpool, they are inspected by the Government inspector, Mr. Moore, and if they are diseased, he draws my attention to it, and they are slaughtered in the borough of Liverpool; if they are free from disease he allows them to go to the Liverpool Cattle Market.

7508. Have you seen amongst those animals much pleuro-pneumonia, or foot-and-mouth disease?—I never saw any case of pleuro-pneumonia at all in the Spanish cattle; I have seen two or three cases of foot-and-mouth disease amongst them.

7509. Has that occurred recently, or do you mean during the whole time that you have been inspector?—In the whole time that I have been inspector, I daresay there have been six or seven cases where there have been a few cattle on board the boats that have been affected with foot-and-mouth disease, and they have been stopped by Mr. Moore, and they have been slaughtered in the borough of Liverpool under our inspection.

7510. But of course, under the order, the whole cargo of animals has been slaughtered at the port?—Yes.

7511. Then, in your judgment, these Spanish and Portuguese animals are, as a race, a healthy race?—They are.

7512. Do

Mr. *Luya.*

27 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

7512. Do you consider them more healthy than the other cattle that you have seen?—I do consider them more healthy than the Irish cattle.

7513. But, comparing them with our English herds, are they quite as healthy?—They are quite as healthy.

7514. Does that apply to the American animals?—It does; the American animals that we have had lately in Liverpool have been very healthy and very fine cattle.

7515. Has the American live cattle trade been long in existence?—It has only been in existence a few months.

7516. And that has been during a time when the passage has been tolerably easy, I suppose?—Yes.

7517. Have you had any experience of cattle coming from America being injured in condition by the voyage?—Yes; we have had some cases where a few have been injured by the voyage, but not many.

7518. During the four and a half years that you have been inspector, it has only been for the last few months, I understand, that the American trade in live animals has been carried on?—Yes; there have been a few odd cases, but not to any extent. We have had about 1,300 in May this year, and we have had about 300 a week since, I think.

7519. So that the trade has, practically, only existed during the last two months?—Practically so.

7520. And during that time they have had fairly fine weather, and therefore, probably, you have not seen the effect of a rough passage upon the animals?—We have not.

7521. I suppose that, from the length of the passage, that enters very largely into the question of the condition in which they would arrive?—I have seen cattle arrive from America in better condition than they arrive in from Ireland; I saw some, last Saturday, arrive in Liverpool, and I never saw cattle arrive in such splendid condition in my life.

7522. To what do you attribute that?—To the care that is taken of them on board the boats, and the accommodation they have.

7523. In consequence of the long voyage that they have to face, greater care is taken of them than would be taken of them on a short passage?—Yes.

7524. Can you describe to the Committee what happens with regard to the examination of those animals from all foreign ports upon their arrival at Liverpool?—When they arrive at Liverpool they are landed on the quay; they are examined by the inspector appointed by the Government, and then they undergo a second examination after an interval of 12 hours.

7525. Are there two examinations?—Yes, one twelve hours after the other.

7526. And it is only after the second examination that they are pronounced free from disease?—Yes.

7527. By whom are the examinations conducted?—They are both made by the Government inspector.

7528. When does your own examination of them take place?—My own examination does not come on until the Government inspector certifies that they are unhealthy or diseased.

7529. You would not be brought in to examine them except in cases where disease appeared?—Only in cases where disease appeared.

Chairman—continued.

7530. Have you any power of going on board ship to examine them before they come into the market?—I think we have now, but we never do; we leave it all to the Government inspector.

7531. It is not a power that is much exercised?—No, it is not.

7532. You trust to the Government inspector at the port to certify as to the condition of the animals?—Yes.

7533. Can you state what the average values of the animals are which come from Ireland, America, and Spain?—The average value of the Irish cattle it is almost impossible to give, because we have such a different class of meat coming from Ireland. The Spanish cattle are a very average lot, and so are the American cattle.

7534. Do they average high prices?—The American cattle have averaged very high prices indeed; I think about 30 *l.* apiece, on an average.

7535. Can you give the average weight of the American animals?—I should average them myself at about 44 score, that is 880 pounds; that is about the average.

7536. How much would that be reduced by the offal?—About 1¼ *d.* per pound represents the offal; that is, the hide, and the small offal, and the fat.

7537. You say that this is the average; do they vary very much?—No, they do not vary very much; they may be a few pounds over, or a few pounds under, but, as near as I can tell, they are worth about that amount in the present state of the market.

7538. Would you represent to this Committee that naturally this market is of great importance?—I think that the Stanley Market is of great importance.

7539. It supplies, naturally, a much wider area than the town itself?—It does.

7540. It supplies a good many towns, I suppose?—Yes, to the Potteries, and as far as Sheffield, Nottingham, Manchester, Wolverhampton, and Birmingham.

7541. And they are now constantly very much dependent for their supplies on the Liverpool Market?—Very much, but not entirely, because the Salford Market has grown very much lately so that they do not depend so much as they formerly did upon the Liverpool Market.

7542. I suppose that, in your opinion, any interference with the Liverpool Market would affect those towns very considerably?—Yes, I think so.

7543. We have had it stated here, in connection with another branch of the inquiry, that the Liverpool people were very particular as to the quality of their meat, and that the demand of these large towns was for meat of very high quality; is that so?—It is so; they are very particular in Liverpool.

7544. It is stated that whenever the cargoes do not reach that high quality, they have to be sent to London, from the fact of their not finding a sale in Liverpool; is that so?—Yes. The fact is this, that what they cannot sell in Liverpool they send up to London.

7545. But is that on account of the quality being inferior, or on account of a glut existing in the market?—Either on account of the glut, or on account of the quality; either cause would act in the same way. What they cannot sell in Liverpool they send right up to the metropolis.

7546. You

Chairman—continued.

7546. You have spoken of this live trade into Liverpool as a necessity for the towns in Lancashire and Yorkshire, and as being a very considerable trade; has there been any dead-meat trade at all established between Ireland and Liverpool?—Formerly there was a very large trade, but it was in cattle that either would not pass the veterinary surgeon's inspection, or else the cattle themselves were not calculated to stand the voyage across the Channel.

7547. Did they come over at that time as a dead-meat trade?—It was made a dead-meat trade.

7548. Did it find a market?—It did at that time.

7549. So that they were not so particular in Liverpool at that time as they are at present?—No, but I can explain it to you. At the time I was appointed I asked the corporation at Liverpool to allow me to prosecute anybody sending diseased meat to Liverpool. I got permission, and we followed it out, and it has almost stopped the trade between Liverpool and Ireland.

7550. In consequence of the restrictions you have brought the condition of the meat which is sold in Liverpool up to the highest quality?—Yes.

7551. Do you see any of the meat that is consigned through to other places?—We do sometimes.

7552. Can you as easily detect disease in the dead meat as you can in the live animals?—No, not so easily.

7553. I suppose it is possible to detect disease in the dead meat?—It is possible in bad cases of pleuro-pneumonia, or bad cases of rinderpest to detect it in the dead meat; but it is not so easy to detect it in the dead meat as in the live animals.

7554. But, in an ordinary case of an animal being affected by disease, it is not so easy to detect it in the meat as in the live animal?—It is not so easy.

7555. It has been stated that rinderpest, that is to say, cattle plague, can be as easily conveyed by dead meat as by living animals; have you had any experience of that?—No, I should not like to say that.

7556. You cannot speak from personal knowledge upon the point?—No. I have heard both ways, but of my own knowledge I do not know.

7557. Do you think that a dead-meat trade having been possible in the past for meat that was not in particularly good condition, it would be possible now to establish a dead-meat trade instead of a live-meat trade with Ireland?—I do not think so.

7558. Can you give any reasons to the Committee for that belief?—If a dead-meat trade were established between Ireland and Liverpool I do not think that they could possibly supply Liverpool with the same amount of stock from Ireland dead that they do alive, and I do not think that they could get it here in the same condition as they get it in alive.

7559. They would have the same supply of animals, and the question is whether they could send it to market in as good a condition if they sent it dead, as they can now by sending it over alive?—I do not believe that they could.

7560. I suppose you admit that the journey not being a very long one, if they could establish

Chairman—continued.

the trade, the dead meat would probably arrive in good condition?—Yes; but anybody that knows anything about the butchering trade will understand that the less meat is handled the better after it has been slaughtered; and, of course, putting it on boats and bringing it from the boats again, must have a great tendency to deteriorate the value of the meat.

7561. You have had some experience, I suppose, at Liverpool, of this new American dead-meat trade?—I have.

7562. One of the principal incidents of the trade is the fact of the meat being subject, as you say, to being often handled before it comes to the market?—It is.

7563. And you have stated to the Committee that that deteriorates the condition of the meat?—Yes, it does.

7564. Having had, as you say, some experience of this American meat, have you seen the condition in which that meat has arrived at Liverpool?—I have.

7565. Do you consider that that meat, having now been imported for a period of some months, is very much depreciated by its being constantly handled?—I think it is.

7566. Have you seen that in the cargoes that have come over?—I have.

7567. Do you wish the Committee to understand that the cargoes coming over are, in your opinion, deteriorated in consequence of the process by which the meat is sent over dead?—Yes, I think so.

7568. Have you had to inspect the dead meat for the purpose of condemning it or otherwise?—I have.

5569. Has there been much condemned in Liverpool?—No, there has not been much condemned.

7570. I suppose you admit that the trade is a very increasing one, and has been growing steadily for many months?—No; it is going backwards sadly.

7571. At Liverpool?—Yes.

7572. Then where would you represent that the trade goes to, because the figures prove that up to the end of April this year the amount of dead meat sent from America into England was larger than the amount which was sent in the whole of last year, 1876, and that it has risen up to something like 6,000,000 lbs. in the last month, showing a steady increase all through?—All I can say is that the trade in American meat in Liverpool has sadly fallen off. There were many shops opened at first; I think that there were eight shops opened at first that sold American meat exclusively, and I think that four of those are closed now. A great number of shops were opened in the lower districts in Liverpool for the sale of American meat, such as greengrocers' and grocers' shops, and they have almost all, to a man, left off selling it. There has been one shop opened recently, and that has closed. But I have made inquiry myself from parties in the trade, and they tell me that the trade is sadly falling off.

7573. Do you mean that you have made inquiries of those people who have been themselves selling American dead meat?—Yes.

7574. And yet the amount that is coming into this country increases?—Yes, but it does not stop in Liverpool; it goes through.

7575. Has that been with a view to its being

Mr. *Luya.*

27 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

supplied to the large towns in Lancashire and Yorkshire?—It has gone down to Sheffield, Manchester, Birmingham, Wolverhampton, and London, and all those places; but the Liverpool trade has fallen off considerably.

7576. Do those towns still continue to buy from the importer who brings it into Liverpool?—I do not think they do. Formerly a great many gentlemen came down to buy the meat, but I think that they have left off doing so.

7577. How do you account for the surplus amount, which clearly must be very great; where does that go to?—It must go to the interior of the country, or to the metropolis.

7578. Though your own personal experience at Liverpool is that the trade there is diminishing, the fact exists that the supply has been steadily increasing; how do you account for that?—I cannot account for that at all; it has been decreasing at Liverpool, without a doubt.

7579. Do you attribute that to the fact of its not coming over in such good condition, or to a prejudice against the meat?—I attribute it partly to prejudice and partly to the repulsive look which it has at times, particularly the rougher part of the meat; that is to say, the briskets and the shoulder pieces have a very repulsive look; the choice pieces often look very nice, but the other parts do not, and very often it is sour, and people who have had it two or three times take a dislike to it.

7580. We have had it in evidence from a gentleman whom I daresay you know, Mr. Giblett, and also from Mr. Link, both of whom come from Liverpool, that many cargoes have arrived in perfect condition, and that it competed fairly with the other meat in the market; and we have also had it in evidence from a London butcher that to his knowledge the American meat was being distributed in London as English meat, and that no complaint arose with regard to it; all those things point to the fact, do they not, that a very large proportion of the supply comes over in good condition?—Yes; a large protion of it certainly does come over in good condition.

7581. That being the case, have you ascertained the fact of the conditions under which that large proportion comes over, and do you not think that when it comes over in bad condition, that may arise from its not being properly prepared, and packed, and stored, as the good meat is?—I do not know.

7582. It has been suggested that is a mere question of speculation, and that in attempting to start a new trade as cheaply as possible, they work it down to the lowest point, and at last they go too far and bring over bad cargoes; would you agree in that view?—There is a good deal in that; but I have seen carcases of beef in the same boat, some of which have been in good condition and others in very middling condition.

7583. Was that meat brought over under conditions which pointed to any failure in the atmospheric influence under which it was brought over, even for a part of the voyage?—I think that it was more attributable to its not having been put on board the boat at first in good condition.

7584. Do you mean that it had not been properly prepared before it came?—It was not properly prepared before it came.

Chairman—continued.

7585. But you admit that a large proportion does arrive in good order?—In very fair order.

7586. Are you able to speak as to whether that was the case last year with regard to some cargoes that arrived in the hot weather?—Some of it arrived in very nice condition, and some arrived in very bad condition.

7587. Still, there were cargoes brought over during the hot weather of last summer in very good condition?—Yes, in very good condition.

7588. Does not that rather point to the fact that it is possible, under certain well-regulated conditions of trade, to bring the meat over in good order?—Yes; it points that way, certainly.

7589. Supposing that the trade was so established and found its level so completely as that those conditions were carried out with regard to all the cargoes, and that all of it came over in that condition in which you admit that much of it has arrived, do you believe that people would then get over this prejudice which the bad meat has produced, and that they would return to the purchasing of it as they did in the first days of its arrival?—No; I do not think that they would; because the taste of the meat is actually different from that of the Irish fat cattle and from that of the Scotch fat cattle.

7590. Do you speak of that from personal experience?—I do. I have tried it, and other people have done the same.

7591. Was the meat that you tasted brought over in good order?—In fair order. I have tasted it in two or three different ways.

7592. That of which the remembrance has remained on your palate is probably what has arrived in bad condition?—No; when it is hot it is very nice, but when it is cold it is a little insipid. I attribute that to the action of the cold air, and to the re-action of the air when it is brought outside the cold chamber.

7593. You think that when it is brought out of the chilled atmosphere in which it was carried over, the exposure to the external air brings out the dampness which has been described, and which takes away the flavour?—It does.

7594. Supposing that the conditions were altered, as they probably would be under a successful trade, and that the meat was kept in the atmosphere in which it came over until it was wanted; do you think that that deterioration would take place?—You cannot keep meat until it is wanted, because you have to expose it in a butcher's shop until it is sold.

7595. We have had evidence before this Committee from butchers that the trade is gradually introducing into London what has been established in America, viz., cool chambers in butchers' shops, in which meat is kept during the hot weather until it is wanted for their customers; under those conditions, would not this meat be kept fresh until it was wanted for actual consumption?—They are trying that now in Liverpool.

7596. Will you kindly explain to the Committee what they are doing there?—That is in the Compton House Stores in Basnett-street.

7597. They have established stores in which the same temperature is maintained as the temperature in which the meat is brought over in the steamers?—Yes; they have a large chamber in the cellars of the building, and in this chamber the cold air is sent through in a sort of refrige-

rator

Chairman—continued.

rator by the same process as is used on board ship, and they keep the meat there until it is wanted. There is a large chamber where the meat is hung, and there is a chamber adjoining that where ice is put, and cold air is blown continually through the meat.

7598. Is the temperature kept down to the same 34 degrees?—They keep it down as low as possible, and as near to the temperature in which it has been brought over as possible.

7599. Has that been established for some time, or is it only just started?—It has only been established, I think, 10 days.

7600. Can you speak to any cargoes having been treated in that way?—Yes; I have seen meat treated in that way.

7601. Have you seen meat brought from the chamber in the steamer, and placed at once in this newly-created cool store?—Yes.

7602. Has that meat been affected at all by the change?—When they have brought it out of this chamber, and exposed it in the air the reaction is very rapid, and the meat becomes damp and clammy, and it is very repulsive looking.

7603. But it has taken some days to come over in the steamer from America; then you state that it has been transferred from the steamer to this chamber; has it been detained in that chamber for any length of time afterwards?—For two or three days.

7604. When it has been brought out of the chamber has the condition of the meat been deteriorated, or has the deterioration taken place after it has been exposed to the atmosphere?—After it has been exposed to the atmosphere.

7605. They have been able to keep it, until it was exposed, in the same way as it was brought over?—Yes.

7606. That points, does it not, to the fact that you would be able to maintain the meat in a condition in which you could put it upon the market, and in which it would remain on the market for a day at least, without deterioration taking place?—I do not think it would.

7607. Do you think that the meat deteriorates so rapidly after it is exposed?—Yes; the first time. After being in the cold air, and then being exposed again to the warm air afterwards, the reaction has a great effect upon the meat.

7608. Have you condemned much of this American meat since it came over?—Not much.

7609. Have those portions of it which you have condemned been condemned recently in the hot weather, or has it been spread over the whole time?—It is spread through the whole time.

7610. Where it is properly prepared and properly brought over the external temperature does not make any particular difference?—No; the meat is sweet when it comes here.

7611. I suppose you have not followed those cargoes which have been sent from Liverpool to London?—I have inquired about them.

7612. Can you speak from your own knowledge upon the subject?—I do not speak of my own knowledge as to those cargoes.

7613. Can you, from your own knowledge, tell the Committee the price at which this American meat has been sold in Liverpool?—It has been sold as high as 6½ *d.* per pound, and as low as 4 *d.* per pound.

7614. I suppose it would not be possible for live Irish animals to compete at all with the American meat if that price was maintained?—It would not.

Chairman—continued.

7615. The price of the American meat, you say, has not sunk below 4 *d.* per pound in Liverpool?—Not to my knowledge. I know from my own knowledge that it has fetched that price.

7616. Can you speak at all as to what has been the effect on the trade in Liverpool since the cattle plague restrictions of last January came into force, prohibiting the import from many countries abroad?—I think it has had a tendency to raise the price of meat in Liverpool.

7617. Has that been the case notwithstanding the supply of dead meat which has come in from America?—Yes, notwithstanding that. If we had not had that meat, we should have had meat very much dearer.

7618. But notwithstanding that, the price has risen since the restrictions have been enforced, preventing the import of cattle?—Yes.

7619. I suppose that that principally affects Liverpool by stopping foreign sheep?—It affects Liverpool very much there.

7620. I gather that you are not very much dependent upon the German cattle proper?—No, we are not; it is the sheep that we are dependent upon.

7621. And you say that the price of mutton has risen in consequence of these restrictions?—Yes, I do.

7622. Are you able to speak to a point which was stated by another witness to this Committee, viz., as to the preference which there seems to be in the manufacturing districts for the small sheep from abroad?—No; I can speak for Liverpool.

7623. Can you state what amount of sheep were brought through to Liverpool, before the restrictions were imposed?—I cannot.

7624. Are you able to speak as to whether, since the restrictions have been imposed, any attempt has been made to bring carcases to Liverpool?—Yes, they bring carcases now to Liverpool from Deptford and other places; they bring large quantities; as many as 2,000 sheep a week have arrived in Liverpool dead.

7625. Does that travel down in good condition?—Generally in good condition, or fair condition.

7626. It comes in such condition as to find a ready market?—Yes, it finds a market, and sometimes a ready market.

7627. Since the restrictions have been imposed, have you been dependent on that supply, or did you bring dead meat from Deptford previously to that?—A portion of it was brought from Deptford previously to that, but we have since depended entirely upon that market for our dead supply.

7628. And you find that you cannot substitute the live sheep from the English market for those foreign sheep?—No; the foreign sheep are small sheep, and they suit the poor class of people on account of their being small joints and there not being so much fat.

7629. Would you represent to the Committee, then, that the restrictions which have forced you into the Deptford Market are injurious?—Yes.

7630. You would rather have the live animal brought through, than have the carcase from Deptford?—Yes, decidedly.

Mr. *Luya.*

27 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

7631. But you are dependent upon these sheep to such an extent that, if their import were stopped, either dead or alive, it would be a serious loss to the manufacturing towns?—Yes, it would be a serious loss to Liverpool.

7632. Supposing that all foreign imports were treated as imports from scheduled countries, you would then have to set up a slaughter-house at Liverpool for those animals; would that meet your requirements in Liverpool?—It would meet the requirements in Liverpool.

7633. But you do not think that it would satisfy the towns around, which supply themselves from the Liverpool market?—No, they would sooner have the sheep alive, if possible.

7634. Then I gather from your evidence, that you wish the Committee to understand, that you think that the import into Liverpool from most of the countries is a healthy import; that the inspection in Liverpool is sufficiently strict to guard you against the importation of disease from those countries; and that the town and manufacturing populations surrounding Liverpool, are very much dependent upon this import of live cattle; and that they are particularly dependent upon the foreign sheep which are brought through from the London market?—Yes, that is the fact.

7635. Is there any other point that you wish to put before the Committee in your examination in chief?—I think not.

Mr. *Arthur Peel.*

7636. You said, did you not, that you never saw a case of pleuro-pneumonia amongst Spanish or Portuguese cattle?—I did say so.

7637. I do not think that the Chairman asked you whether you had seen any amongst American cattle; have you seen pleuro-pneumonia amongst them?—I have not seen it amongst the American cattle.

7638. Have you seen it among any imported cattle?—No, not among imported cattle, except from Ireland; we have seen it from Ireland.

7639. What position do you hold as regards the Government inspectors; I understand you to say, that you are not called in until the Government inspector has reported a case of disease?—That is the fact.

7640. Is that for the purpose of enabling you to carry out the regulations of the local authorities?—Yes, that is so.

7641. Have you been on board these Irish boats that have come to Liverpool?—I have, several times.

7642. Can you speak as to the condition of those boats that carry cattle, as regards their cleanliness and the general arrangements for the comfort of the animals?—They are very often overcrowded; that is the only particular thing that I can say about them. They are very good boats, and they are well adapted for the purpose.

7643. Are the cattle carried on deck or below?—Both on deck and below.

7644. Have you ever seen the hatches opened?—Yes, I have been down.

7645. Have you seen anything objectionable?—It has been very hot down there.

7646. But you have never seen the animals suffering?—No; I have never seen the animals suffering, except there has been a lame beast or something of that kind.

7647. Have you seen the animals come out of

Mr. *Arthur Peel*—continued.

those boats with disease upon them?—Yes, I have.

7648. With foot-and-mouth disease?—Yes, with foot-and-mouth disease.

7649. With pleuro-pneumonia?—I would rather not say that; I have seen them with pleuro-pneumonia; I cannot speak as to that.

7650. Can you give any reason why the American live cattle trade to Liverpool has only sprung up within the last few months?—I cannot give any reason why it has not.

7651. Did it not exist at all before that?—It did in a small proportion, but not to the same extent that it does now.

7652. But it has suddenly sprung up to 1,300 in one month?—That was gradually going on. We had a few cattle by different boats before, but not many. It sprung up in about two months very much indeed.

7653. Since it has sprung up, what effect do you think that the dead-meat importation from America has had upon the price of the live cattle?—It would go against the dead meat, and be in favour of the live cattle. The people would give more per pound for the live cattle than they would for the dead meat.

7654. You stated, I think, the average weight of the American beasts; are you able to speak of the price per pound that the live cattle fetched?—Yes; about 8*d.* to 8¼*d.* per pound, slaughtered in Liverpool.

7655. Was that at the same time that the American dead meat was fetching from 4*d.* to 6*d.* per pound?—Yes; 7¾*d.* to 8¼*d.* per pound was about the price of the live meat, and the price of the dead meat was about 4*d.* to 6*d.* per pound at the same time.

7656. Then do you think that the live-cattle trade is driving the dead-meat trade out?—I think it is.

7657. When you were talking of the price of the live American beast, you said that the offal represented 1¼*d.* per pound; do you mean to say that is the price of offal per pound?—No; if the beast is bought at 8*d.* per pound the carcase would lie at 7*d.* per pound.

7658. What would be the weight of offal in each beast?—The hide would be about 93 lbs., and the fat about 75 lbs., and then you would have the tripe. I could not give you the total weight without reckoning it up, but I could tell you the weight of any portion of it.

7659. You say that one reason why the meat kept in the refrigerating stores that are now being set up in Liverpool deteriorates, is on account of its being handled so much; I suppose that the moving from the boats to these refrigerators entails a double handling?—It does.

7660. Do you think, therefore, that that will prove a success?—I do not think that it will, because the less you handle meat after it is slaughtered the better.

Colonel *Kingscote.*

7661. I want to understand a little more clearly what are your powers or your orders from the corporation of Liverpool as to inspecting the animals which are landed; you say that the Government inspector goes on board the vessels; but is it part of your duty to go on board the vessels?—It is not.

7662. When does your duty begin?—When the

Colonel *Kingscote*—continued.

the Government inspector declares the animals to be affected with any contagious disease.

7663. You have to wait until he declares the animals to be affected with contagious disease before you put yourself into action?—Yes; that is so.

7664. And then you step in and take it off his hands?—I step in and take it off his hands then, acting under the local authority.

7665. Supposing that anybody is fined for having diseased animals in the town of Liverpool, do you, as inspector, get half the fine?—No; we get nothing.

7666. You are paid by salary by the corporation?—By salary.

7667. And you have no actual power to go on board a vessel and see for yourself whether there is disease there?—It is a power that we never exercise, because we should clash with the Government inspector.

7668. Is it your business to go about the town to try and seek out disease, or do you wait until somebody tells you of it?—It is our duty to go about the town, but it is not our duty to go on board of the boats at the docks; that is the Government inspector's duty. If we find any disease in the dairy that they did not report to us, then we should prosecute them for having a diseased beast on their premises.

7669. Then you have had nothing to do with cattle that are in the docks themselves, wherever they come from, whether they come from Ireland or from anywhere else?—No, not until they are reported upon by the Government inspector.

7670. What boats come to Liverpool with Irish cattle?—A great many.

7671. Do they come daily?—Yes, daily.

7672. Are they steamers or sailing vessels?—They are very large steamers.

Mr. *Pease.*

7673. Have you had many cargoes of South American cattle into Liverpool?—Not many.

7674. In what condition have those animals arrived?—The South American animals have been in very moderate condition.

7675. Have they had any disease amongst them?—I think not.

7676. You mean that they came in moderate condition considering the length of the voyage?—Yes, considering the length of the voyage.

7677. Do you think that that trade is likely to increase?—No, I think not.

Mr. *Elliot.*

7678. You said that some of the animals that were landed at Liverpool from America had suffered by the journey; do you know that some have been thrown overboard and lost entirely?—Yes, I have heard that many have been thrown overboard, but not a great many.

7679. Therefore there must have been a certain amount of loss through that?—Yes, a certain amount of loss. It is just the same with Irish cattle; we have sometimes had a great number of Irish cattle smothered on board of the Irish boats.

7680. You said that you considered that proper precautions were taken on board the American boats for the carriage of live cattle; can you tell the Committee what those precautions are, as compared with the precautions which are taken on board the Irish boats?—The extra precautions

Mr. *Elliot*—continued.

which are taken on the American boats are that they do not overcrowd them so much as they do on board the Irish boats.

7681. And the boats are larger, and there is not so much oscillation?—Just so.

7682. I think you said that what they cannot sell in Liverpool they send to London; did you refer to dead meat?—Yes.

7683. Therefore the meat must wait in Liverpool for a certain time to try for a market before it is sent to London?—I do not think that it is kept very long. The salesmen know directly what meat they can do with in Liverpool, and they send the surplus to London.

7684. But you say that it loses condition quickly?—Yes.

7685. And, therefore, it comes to London in inferior condition?—Yes, in very middling condition sometimes.

7686. You said that the trade in American meat at Liverpool has gone back very much lately; have you any statistics as to the quantity which is imported into Liverpool?—I have not; I speak from simple observation. I know the shops where American beef is sold, and we go round every day, and we know very well what trade they do.

7587. Is it not the case that, in order to save time, the meat is sent direct to other places instead of stopping at Liverpool, and may not that account for the apparent falling off of the trade in Liverpool?—No, it is because they cannot sell it in Liverpool.

Mr. *Dease.*

7688. You say that the trade has gone back in Liverpool; is that caused by the season of the year?—No, I do not think it is that; I think it is more from the repulsive look of some parts of the meat. The American meat is very nice looking meat if it has been killed in Liverpool, but when it has been killed and sent from the boats, it has a very repulsive look, particularly the rougher parts of the meat.

7689. As small quantities have been coming over lately, do you think that the decrease is owing to the season, or to there not being a good sale?—I think it is owing to there not being a good sale in Liverpool. We should be very glad if the American meat would come; we want it very badly.

Mr. *M'Lagan.*

7690. Is there any other dead meat imported into Liverpool than American dead meat?—There is dead meat brought from Deptford; the dead sheep that I was talking about.

7691. Is there none sent from Scotland?—Very little indeed.

7692. With the exception of that from Deptford and from America, has no dead meat been sent to Liverpool?—Yes, we have seen meat sent from Ireland.

7963. What is the condition of the Scotch beef when it comes to Liverpool?—Some of it has come in very middling condition, but we have had very little of it.

7694. You used the expression, with regard to American dead meat, that it is very repulsive looking?—Some parts of it look very repulsive; it looks like beef that has been smothered, or not properly bled; the blood has not been properly drawn from it.

Mr. *Luya.*

27 June 1877.

Mr. *M'Lagan*—continued.

7695. Then of course it would become putrid much sooner than if it were properly bled?—Yes. The American meat is not smothered meat, but it has that appearance from being put in a refrigerator, and being handled so very much.

7696. It has a repulsive appearance on that account?—It has a repulsive appearance from being handled.

7697. And that is the case even with the best American beef that comes to Liverpool?—Generally speaking, yes.

7698. Perhaps you are not aware that some of the second class stuff that you send up from Liverpool is used in the best houses in London, although you say it is repulsive looking?—I am not aware of that.

7699. You are not aware that it has been given in evidence that it is used in the best West End houses?—I could not contradict it, but I am not aware of it.

7700. You are not a veterinary surgeon, I suppose?—I am not.

7701. You know the distinctive characters and symptoms of the different diseases of rinderpest, pleuro-pneumonia, and foot-and-mouth disease?—Yes, from experience.

7702. Do you think that you would not be liable to make a mistake between rinderpest and typhoid fever?—No, I do not think I should make a mistake there.

7703. Have you heard that some serious mistakes have been made by veterinary surgeons?—I have.

7704. But you have sufficient experience and skill not to make such mistakes?—I do not think I should make a mistake there.

Mr. *Torr.*

7705. Are you an inspector of live animals or of dead meat?—I am inspector of dead meat.

7706. Is that your special appointment?—That is my special appointment, as a meat inspector under the corporation of Liverpool.

7707. Have you given special attention to this American meat?—I have given special attention to it.

7708. Is it true, or not, that there is a general prejudice against the American meat?—It is true that there is a general prejudice against it, but I know that the majority of people in Liverpool would be very anxious to see large quantities of it come, and in fact it has been a great blessing to the people of Liverpool that it has come.

7709. There is no wish to discourage the import of American meat?—No; there is every desire to encourage it.

7710. From your own observation, do you not think that there are appliances by which this meat might be brought in more perfect condition than it has hitherto been brought in?—I do not think so, and I will tell you my reason: When meat is killed the less it is handled, and the less it is knocked about the better; it loses its gloss, it loses its appearance, and it never gets so firm after being knocked about as when it is hung up, and allowed to get properly cold after it has been slaughtered.

7711. We are told that the American meat is not much handled; that it is killed, then passed through a refrigerator on the other side reduced to a low temperature, then put in these cases on board ship, and never meddled with until it is

Mr. *Torr*—continued.

taken out on its arrival in Liverpool; is that the case?—I believe it is the case; but the very fact of moving it from on board the boats in Liverpool to the shops where it is sold again entails a certain amount of handling, which deteriorates the meat, and makes the meat not look so nice as meat which is actually slaughtered in Liverpool.

7712. It is not so inviting?—No, it is not.

7713. It has been stated before this Committee that a great deal depends upon the condition in which it is shipped; do you agree with that?—A great deal must depend upon it.

7714. And having passed through a refrigerator is an essential point?—I do not know whether it is an essential point or not if the meat was landed in Liverpool in perfectly fresh order. The less access the air has to it the better.

7715. Have you yourself been present on board those steamers, the Inman boats or the other boats, when the compartment has been opened?—I have.

7716. Does the air in the compartment appear cold to you?—Very cold.

7717. Up to that point what appearance does the meat present?—If you remove the cloths then it has not the same nice appearance as the meat that is killed in Liverpool.

7718. Do you think that there is anything in what butchers term the cutting, that is to say the dressing, of the meat; is it well killed and cut?—It is very well dressed indeed.

7719. Then you attribute the difference in the appearance entirely to the length of time that it has been killed?—Yes, and to the handling of the meat.

7720. And to the exposure to the cold unnatural atmosphere?—Yes.

7721. But, in your judgment, is it a trade that will decrease or increase?—In my opinion, though I am very sorry to say so, I think it will decrease. If they can import live cattle it is sure to drive the dead meat out of the market.

7722. But do you not think that in summer time, when the sea is more still, they might send the cattle over alive, and that in winter time they might send the meat over dead?—I do not think that there is anything to stop their sending over live cattle all the year round.

7723. Then you think that the live cattle trade with America will increase?—I do.

7724. And that the dead cattle trade will diminish?—I think so in my own judgment.

7725. Where are these live cattle chiefly shipped from?—From Chicago.

7726. But from what port in America?—I believe it is from New York. I do not know, indeed, where it comes from.

7727. By what line do they come?—By the Allan line.

7728. That is a Canadian line?—Yes; and by the Dominion line.

7729. The Dominion line is a Canadian line?—Yes. There is a boat called the "Memphis," which arrived on Saturday. I was on board of her.

7730. Do you know, of your own knowledge, whether any of the New York lines, the Inman line or the Cunard line, have brought live animals?—I do not know of my own knowledge.

7731. Then do you say that this increase in the American live cattle trade has really taken place

Mr. *Torr*—continued.

place within the last two months, just coincidently with the setting-in of summer?—Yes.

7732. And, at the same time, the dead-meat supply has diminished?—The dead-meat supply in Liverpool has diminished.

7733. But you would probably feel that if the dead meat could, by any improved process, be brought to the market in a better state, the prejudice against it would pass off?—Yes, I think it would pass off.

7734. You say that the price of the American dead meat is from 4 *d.* to 6 *d.* per pound?—That has been the price of American dead meat.

7735. And the price of live American meat has been from 7 *d.* to 8 *d.* per pound?—Yes.

7736. Then you say that the offal is 1¼ *d.* per pound; would that be deducted from the 8 *d.*?—Yes; that would be deducted from the 8¼ *d.*

7737. Then it brings the dead meat and the live meat to within about ¼ *d.* per pound?—No. I think I stated that the live cattle were worth 8½ *d.* per pound; and if you take 1¼ *d.* per pound for the offal from that, it leaves 7¼ *d.* per pound; that is for the carcase.

7738. But you mean that 1¼ *d.* on the offal is a reduction on the live price which you quoted?—Yes, from 8½ *d.* per pound.

7739. Do you know whether, in bringing those animals across, many deaths have occurred?—Lately, I believe, there have been very few. I have made inquiries, and I believe that there are very few. There was one, I think, on board the "Memphis."

Colonel *Kingscote.*

7740. Out of how many?—I think there were nearly 200 on Saturday. I made inquiries on board the boat, and they told me that there had been only one death on board.

Mr. *Torr.*

7741. Are those cattle brought in separate stalls?—In the "Memphis," I think, there were three or four in one compartment.

7742. But you said that they were not bruised, I think?—No, I did not say so.

7743. Do you not think that, unless they were put in stalls (as, for instance, is done on the railways), the stalls being well wadded on either side, they would be apt to bruise very much?—They would; but what I saw on Saturday seemed to have come in very good condition, and on all the other American boats from which I have seen cattle landed the cattle have been in very good condition.

7744. But that has been in fine weather?—They have had fine weather.

7745. Have you seen any case in which live cattle have been landed from one of these American boats, in which you have understood that they have had bad weather on the passage?—I have heard it said that they have had moderately bad weather, but not very bad weather.

7746. Do you think that in the depth of winter, when, you know, the Atlantic voyage is a very severe one, they would not have many casualties and much damage to fat cattle?—No; I think that with the increased experience in the bringing of live cattle, they would be able to bring them perfectly safe in winter-time.

Mr. *W. E. Forster.*

7747. What are your duties as inspector of

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

dead meat at Liverpool?—We come under the local authority. We come in after the Government inspectors have declared any disease to exist in cattle, but we have power to visit shipping and lairs in the borough of Liverpool.

7748. It is the business of the Government inspectors to inform you of cases of foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia in imported cattle, is it not?—Yes.

7749. Have you had many cases in which foreign cattle have been imported with foot-and-mouth disease?—Not many.

7750. When was the last case that you had?—I think it is about six months ago, as nearly as I can recollect.

7751. Where did they come from?—They came from Oporto.

7752. How many animals were there?—About 200, I think.

7753. How many were affected with the disease?—I think three or four.

7754. What was done with the others?—They were all slaughtered in the borough of Liverpool.

7755. Have you had any cases of pleuro-pneumonia?—No, not one; I have never seen one in foreign beasts.

7756. As regards the Irish import, have you had any cases of foot-and-mouth disease amongst those cattle?—Yes, frequently.

7757. Coming pretty constantly through the year?—Yes, coming more or less through the year.

7758. Supposing that there are some animals in an Irish cargo that are affected, what is done with the rest?—If a cargo of cattle comes from Ireland in which there is one beast affected with foot-and-mouth disease the Government inspector allows the others to go after a certain interval, but the one that is affected is slaughtered in the borough of Liverpool.

7759. There is this difference, is there not, between Oporto cattle and Irish cattle: that if there is one animal affected in a cargo of Oporto cattle all the others are slaughtered, whether they are affected or not; and if there is one animal affected in a cargo of Irish cattle that one animal is slaughtered, and the rest are allowed to go off to market after a certain interval?—Yes, that is the difference.

7760. Have you had any cases of pleuro-pneumonia from Ireland?—Yes, in animals which have not been stopped by the veterinary surgeon, but in which we found it after the beasts had been brought down to Liverpool and slaughtered.

7761. How long ago is it since you had a case?—I should think about six months, as nearly as I can tell. There were some beasts slaughtered at the abattoir at Liverpool which were suffering from pleuro-pneumonia.

7762. Then merely stopping the foreign import into Liverpool would have no effect upon the spread of foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia?—No, I do not think it would.

7763. Liverpool is not a scheduled port, is it?—No.

7764. No cattle can arrive there from Germany?—No, they cannot.

Mr. *Anderson.*

7765. You have been on board the vessels by which the Irish live cattle come into Liverpool?—Yes.

7766. And

Mr. *Luya.*

27 June 1877.

Mr. *Anderson*—continued.

7766. And you have been on board the vessels by which the American live cattle come to Liverpool?—Yes.

7767. Are the fittings of the two classes of vessels the same?—They are something similar.

7768. Are there bulkheads, or pens, or what?—There are bulkheads and pens in some boats. There are pens for the sheep, and the cattle are tied in rows, and certain divisions are made between them; not between every two beasts, but between certain numbers.

Mr. *Anderson*—continued.

7769. Are those strong bulkheads, that would not break away in rough weather?—Yes.

7770. Is that the case both on the Irish vessels and on the American vessels?—Both on the Irish vessels and on the American vessels.

Mr. WILLIAM WALKER, called in; and Examined.

Mr. *Walker.*

Chairman.

7771. I BELIEVE you are connected with the Leeds Butchers' Association?—I am.

7772. And as such you speak naturally the feeling of that body in Leeds?—Yes.

7773. I suppose that is a representative association, fairly representing the trade of the inland towns in that district?—Yes.

7774. Do you deal largely in foreign cattle in Leeds?—I have not dealt largely in them this last year at all; in fact, I have had none this last year.

7775. Do you mean the whole of the last 12 months, or only since the restrictions have been imposed with regard to cattle plague?—It is in the last 12 months.

7776. Has it been the habit of the trade in Leeds not to deal in the foreign import during that time?—There has been so little of that class landed in Hull that it has not been worth while going to fetch it, I think.

7777. Even before the recent restrictions were imposed, the trade had fallen off?—Yes.

7778. That trade from Hull, I suppose, is a trade in the cattle principally from Denmark and from Schleswig-Holstein?—Yes.

7779. Can you tell the Committee what the conditions of that trade were some time back; was it a large trade that had fallen off, or has it always been a small trade?—It was a very large trade indeed up to about 12 months ago, or rather more than that; but with the restrictions, and various other things, it has fallen off entirely.

7780. You say that that has been from the restrictions; do you mean that within the last 12 months additional restrictions have been put on as regards the port of Hull?—I do not know whether there were fresh restrictions, but the restrictions appeared to be so heavy upon them that the parties from the other side would not send the cattle; because, if there was one animal affected in the cargo, the whole cargo was compelled to be slaughtered at the port of landing.

7781. Do you know how long those restrictions have been applied to the port of Hull?—It is about 12 months since I was there, and so I cannot say.

7782. You do not know under what conditions the import into Hull took place previously to that time?—Not exactly.

7783. You do not know whether those conditions were the same then as were in force during the first six months of the year of which you have just been speaking; that is to say, the last six months of last year?—I think that they were pretty similar.

7784. But really the altered state of things has arisen since the restrictions were imposed in January?—Seemingly so.

Chairman—continued.

7785. But you represent to the Committee that the trade from abroad had fallen off previously to that?—Yes.

7786. And that I suppose was in consequence of Hull being a port at which the animals from scheduled countries are slaughtered?—Yes.

7787. But before those restrictions were imposed, the animals from unscheduled countries would come freely into the port of Hull, and be distributed from there?—If they were passed by the Government inspector in Hull, they were allowed then to be sold and sent inland. For instance, I generally used to go and buy them alive, if I could, to bring them away to my own place to kill; but if I could not buy them to come away alive, I then had to bring them to kill there; and with the inconvenience and the cost it fell to very nearly nothing. Parties began to send less cattle to Hull, and I think sent them to other places; for instance, to Newcastle. The trade seems to have left Hull entirely, and to have gone to Newcastle.

7788. I do not quite realise what you want to convey to the Committee, because I understood that Hull, up to January of this year, when the prohibition of import took place, was a port into which animals from Denmark and Schleswig could come free for circulation, and any animal coming from a scheduled country would come there to be slaughtered at the port; and it is only since January of this year that the alterations in the restrictions had taken place; but yet you say that, although the circulation of animals was allowed previously to that time, the trade had fallen off?—I do not know from what cause it has fallen off, save and except it be from this, that many of the parties have sent their cattle elsewhere, where they could move them away better than we can from Hull.

7789. What I suppose you will represent is, that you think that the cattle coming from countries where no infection existed should be allowed to circulate freely through the country for the benefit of the inland towns?—Yes.

7790. In your dealing with the trade in Hull, do you find great deterioration in the meat slaughtered at the port, as compared with the meat of the cattle that you could take away and slaughter in your own town?—I do.

7791. Can you speak as to how that affected the animal?—It would affect it to the extent of from $\frac{1}{4}$ *d.* to $\frac{1}{2}$ *d.* per pound.

7792. It made a difference of from a $\frac{1}{4}$ *d.* to a $\frac{1}{2}$ *d.* per pound whether you could take the animal alive to Leeds or whether you had to take it there as a slaughtered beast?—Yes.

7793. That is with regard to your supply through the port of Hull. Are you dependent in Leeds at all on Irish cattle?—Yes; after leaving

leaving off buying foreign cattle last year, I turned my attention to the Irish cattle, and I have generally filled my hands with the Irish cattle, finding that by doing so I could kill them at my own home, and that I could make more of them.

7794. I suppose that you would also represent to the Committee that you would not be able to keep that trade up if it was a dead-meat trade from Ireland instead of a trade in live cattle?—We should not.

7795. Have you a large trade in offal in Leeds?—We make a very fair price of our offals in Leeds.

7796. Are there many people there who are dependent upon the offal?—The smaller offals come in for the poorer classes of the people, and they are very well disposed of as a rule; it is very well cleared up.

7797. When the live trade diminished and you were obliged to buy the animals to slaughter at Hull, how did you meet the demand for offal in your town; could you bring the offal from Hull?—If I bought a beast in Hull to kill in Hull I then had the offal to bring to Leeds, which deteriorated it a great deal in value.

7798. You mean that the mere fact of the carriage of the offal from Hull to Leeds reduced its value?—Yes.

7799. And you represent that a certain portion of the inhabitants of your town depend largely upon the supply of offal?—I do.

7800. Do you believe that the offal of an animal which was slaughtered abroad could be brought over in sufficiently good condition to compete with the offal of an animal which is killed in this country?—I do not think it could.

7801. With regard to these two trades as supplying Leeds, can you tell the Committee whether there is any difference between the cost of carrying the live animals and the cost of carrying the dead meat?—I could get a wagon load of cattle brought from Hull to Leeds for about 28 *s.*, I think.

7802. What number of cattle would a wagon load represent?—Eight cattle. If I had those eight beasts to slaughter in Hull they would stand me in something like 15 *s.* a head for carriage and slaughtering.

7803. The carriage of the meat and the slaughter, would come to 15 *s.* a head?—It would come to all that. Then the deterioration in the value of the article would be another 4 *d.* per stone at least. If I buy eight beasts in Hull to kill in Hull, in the first place I should have to give two men half-a-crown to dress the beast; that is to say, to slaughter it and dress it; then I should have to give to the man holding the premises where the cattle were slaughtered, in goods and money, something like six or seven shillings a-piece very likely; I give him half-a-crown in money, and I give him the tripes, and the feet, and the manifolds, and the maw, and the blood, and the small entrails, and the manure, which is altogether worth to him, six or seven shillings, no doubt. The carriage is 1 *s.* per hundred weight, and the carriage of the offal is less, but not much. Altogether it costs about 15 *s.* or 16 *s.* per beast for killing in Hull and carriage to Leeds.

7804. Therefore the cost of bringing eight live animals from Hull to Leeds would be 28 *s.*; whereas if you killed them in Hull and brought them dead to Leeds, they would cost you something like 15 *s.* per head?—Yes.

7805. Have you had anything to do lately with this American dead meat?—I have not.

7806. Has it been imported at all into Leeds?—There is an agency in Leeds, but I have never bought any, either of them or of anybody else. A few have come to Leeds; in the first place some came, but now last week, I think, they had none. Up to last week, I think, they had a few.

7807. Have you any dead meat imported into Leeds from the Continent?—No.

7808. You have had no dead meat at all there, excepting what you got from Hull at the time you speak of?—Up to the time of the American beef coming.

7809. And you are not able to speak of the condition in which that American meat has come over?—I have seen it when it has been landed at Leeds from the railroad.

7810. That is after it has been moved from the steamer, and has travelled some hours on the railroad?—Yes, from Liverpool to Leeds.

7811. When you saw it, was it in good condition?—Some of it was in very fair condition, and some of it was only in moderate condition.

7812. Was that which arrived in fair condition, meat that would compete in the market with the other meat which you have had to dispose of?—When it first came to Leeds, it was run after by the people.

7813. That was on account of its price, I imagine?—Yes, but now it is not run after at all.

7814. Do you think that is because it is deteriorated in condition, or because the people only went after it when it was a novelty, and that they have got tired of it now?—I think that a great deal of it was bought merely from its novelty.

7815. But there is nothing in the meat, as I understand you, which, if it was sold at a price of that sort, would render it unlikely to become a marketable commodity, if it arrived in fair condition?—Not so much so. It seemed to be partly the meat and partly the novelty, I think, which caused its sale at first.

7816. In your opinion, the dead-meat trade, even if the meat came over in good condition, would not supply your wants in Leeds?—I believe it would not. Yorkshiremen seem to like to see their meat fresh and nice.

7817. And you represent that dead meat coming over, under those conditions, does not possess the freshness of the meat that is killed at home?—It does not.

7818. I think that at Leeds there are considerable dairies in the town?—Yes, there are many, but they are not particularly large; the largest of the dairies are outside the town.

7819. Are you able to speak at all as to the condition of those dairies, and as to whether disease has been produced from them?—Not particularly so, but I think that some of them require better drainage, better ventilation, and greater cleanliness.

7820. Has it come within your knowledge that beasts affected with disease have got into the market from those dairies?—No, I think not.

7821. Of course the advantage, if any, of this dead-meat trade with America has been in the low price at which the meat can be bought?—Yes, I think so.

Mr. *Walker*.

27 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

7822. Do you believe that, at its present price, it would continue to compete in the market with English meat?—The people do not seem to run after it so much as they did; that is all I can say.

7823. And you represent that you believe that the price will fall?—Yes, I think it will.

7824. And, therefore, that it will not become a paying concern?—I do not think it will.

7825. I suppose what you would represent is, that the feeling of the butchers in Leeds, and in those central towns generally, would be that from their knowledge of the trade they think that inland towns are very much dependent upon the continuance of a live cattle trade; and that, therefore, they would urge that from all countries from which cattle could be imported free from disease they should be allowed to circulate freely through the country?—Yes, they would.

7826. And that you would represent in the interest of the general food supply of the public?—Yes.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*.

7827. In the way of your trade, I suppose you are likely to hear of animals that are found to be affected with pleuro-pneumonia in Leeds?—We have very little indeed.

7828. How many cases have you heard of late?—I have heard of only three cases; one in 1874, one in 1875, and one in 1876.

7829. Those are all that you have heard of in Leeds and its neighbourhood?—Yes.

7830. You have been in the trade for some time, I suppose?—Yes; for 30 years.

7831. Prices have risen very much since you have been in the trade, have they not?—Yes; they have very much.

7832. Do you remember what the price of beef was per pound at Leeds when you first went into the trade?—Yes; it was about from 4½ *d.* to 5 *d.* per pound.

7833. And what is it now?—From about 7½ *d.* to 8 *d.* per pound. That is for the carcase. In odd instances we are selling them at 8¼ *d.* per pound.

7834. To what do you mainly attribute this rise in the price of meat?—The population is greater. The stock may be more, but I do not know exactly; but the population is greater, and seems to demand more meat.

7835. Taking one year with another, and not taking a time of special depression of trade, is it not the case that, generally speaking, the working classes are able to buy more meat than they formerly were?—Yes, they are, but not at present.

7836. At the present time trade is bad in Leeds, I suppose?—It is.

7837. And yet the price has not much fallen?—Not particularly so.

7838. Do you get dead meat down from London?—We have had it, but it is very seldom.

7839. Does it come from the Deptford Market when it comes?—The parties that bought it in London bought it in the Metropolitan Market, I think.

7840. You do not know whether the dead meat that comes to you is foreign meat or home meat?—I think that it would be foreign meat.

7841. Is it American meat?—No; I think it was before the American meat came; it is some time since.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

7842. Do any live foreign animals come to you from London?—No, I think not.

7843. Do all your live animals come from Hull?—No; they come from Newcastle now. There may be a few from Hull, but not many.

7844. Supposing that no live foreign animals were allowed to come to Leeds, what effect would it have upon your market?—It would have a great effect; it would make meat a good deal dearer.

Mr. *M'Lagan*.

7845. Do you remember when foreign cattle were first brought to Leeds?—I think that I bought foreign cattle just after I commenced butchering, about 30 years ago.

7846. And since the importation of foreign cattle the price has steadily risen, has it not?—Yes.

7847. After the importation of dead meat from America did the price fall or rise?—It seemed to have a tendency in the trade generally to fall perhaps about ¼ *d.* per pound on our trade at home.

7848. But it is a fact that, contemporaneously with the importation of foreign cattle, the price of beef rose?—Yes.

7849. I think you stated that it rose from 4½ *d.* per pound to 7¾ *d.* per pound?—Yes.

7850. I think you stated that that arose in some measure from the increased consumption of butchers' meat by the people?—Yes.

7851. Do you think that it arose from no other cause?—I am not aware of any other cause.

7852. Of course you remember that about 1865 there were a great many deaths amongst cattle in the country from rinderpest?—Yes.

7853. That would reduce the number of cattle very much, would it not?—There is no doubt that it would.

7854. Was there not a considerable rise in the price of beef about that time?—After that time there was.

7855. And therefore, though you have had an importation of live stock, owing to the importation of diseases into the country by live stock, there has been a reduced number of cattle, and the price of meat has risen?—I do not exactly know that.

7856. I think you said that after 1865 there was a considerable rise in the price of beef?—So there was, but I do not know that it is a fact that the cattle from the Continent brought disease.

7857. How was rinderpest brought into this country?—I cannot tell.

7858. Have you never heard that it came from the Continent?—I have heard people say so, but I do not know that it did.

7859. You do not know anything about the importation of these diseases, viz., rinderpest, pleuro-pneumonia, and foot-and-mouth disease; and you are not prepared to speak on the question?—I do not know anything about it.

7860. You do not know whether they originated in this country, or whether they come from the Continent?—I do not know at all.

7861. But there is no doubt of this fact, that the effect of the importation of dead meat from America was to reduce the price of beef in Leeds?—It did reduce it for a short time.

7862. It did so until it was taken out of the market again?—Yes.

7863. And

Mr. *M'Lagan*—continued.

7863. And if it had continued to be imported into Leeds in sufficient quantities, there is no reason why the price of meat should have risen again?—They have been importing it right away, at least it has been brought to Leeds right up to last week.

7864. But it has come in reduced quantities?—Yes; it has come in reduced quantities, and that is a proof to me that the people will not have it, because, in case they had wanted it, the parties would have brought a similar quantity every week; but they have not wanted it.

7865. Have the people ceased to buy it?—They have ceased to buy it in a great measure.

7866. What was done with it then?—They have to do the best they can with it; they have to make anything they can of it, especially the rougher cuts of it. A bit of choice prime meat might perhaps be sold at a moderate price, but the rough meat could be made nothing of, to a great extent.

7867. Did that American beef come from Liverpool?—It did.

7868. How long did it take to bring that beef from Liverpool to Leeds?—I should think it would be loaded at Liverpool towards seven or eight o'clock in the evening, and it would be in the shambles at Leeds the next morning; I do not know how long it takes to come, but not long.

7869. It was just carried, I suppose, like any ordinary merchandise; there was no protection from the hot blasts of air, or from anything else?—I suppose so.

7870. There were no precautions whatever taken to keep it in a cool place?—No; I should think that it would be put in waggons, and brought as all other meat is.

7871. You do not know whether it was exposed for sale in the Liverpool market first?—I do not.

7872. You do not know whether it came direct from the ship to Leeds?—I do not know, but I believe it came from the ship direct.

7873. Do you not think that it would have come in better condition if there had been proper precautions taken during the journey for its transport, such as having well-ventilated cars?—I do not know; I should think that a waggon travelling on a railway would be as good a protection as anything, because the air would get about it as well in that way as any way, especially coming at the speed at which they would come.

7874. Then I gather from your evidence that we need not look to the importation of dead meat from America for a reduction of the price of butchers' meat for the people?—No, I believe not.

Mr. *Dease.*

7875. Have you ever seen dead meat brought into Leeds from Scotland, or from any other part of the United Kingdom?—No, not often, except during the rinderpest; some carcases were then brought from Scotland, but only a few.

7876. Was the meat which was thus brought in an inferior condition to meat killed in Leeds, or was it in as good condition?—It was not in as good condition, though it was not in very inferior condition; but there is a wonderful difference between the transit of beef for something like a couple of hundred miles, and the transit of beef for a journey of eight or 10 days over the sea, and then two or three days' delay after it has got into this country, and then a journey inland.

Mr. *Dease*—continued.

7877. That is in reference to the American meat?—Yes.

7878. When the American meat is brought in, you say that it is in an inferior condition to other meat carried from any part of the United Kingdom?—I do.

7879. But it has been stated in evidence that when it is taken out of the refrigerator it is in excellent condition?—That I cannot say anything about; but when it is taken and travels inland, especially in the hot weather, it will always be very much affected by it.

7880. All meat?—Yes, all meat.

Mr. *Elliot.*

7881. You are aware that there was an immense loss of cattle in 1865?—Yes, I believe there was.

7882. And after that the price rose?—Yes.

7883. But you do not think that the loss materially affected the price; is that your evidence?—It did not affect the price very much, I think.

7884. And therefore you do not think that the loss in one year of some hundreds of thousands of animals can materially affect the price of meat in this country?—It seems to have been made up by beasts from other countries.

Mr. *King Harman.*

7885. I think you told an honourable Member that the Leeds butchers do not frequent the London market for the purpose of buying foreign cattle alive?—They do not.

7886. Do the butchers from the large towns of Yorkshire in the neighbourhood of Leeds frequent the London market for the purpose of buying foreign cattle alive?—They come to Leeds, and the cattle that are shown in Leeds are chiefly Irish beasts, or beasts from the north.

7887. I do not mean at the present moment, when there are restrictions upon the foreign cattle; but before there were restrictions, did the Yorkshire butchers, as a rule, go to London to purchase foreign cattle?—They did not.

7888. You gave one or two reasons for the rise in the price of beef; I suppose that butchering was a very good trade when the prices were low, was it not?—Well, just moderate.

7889. But it is a good trade now, is it not?—I dispute that; I do not say so.

7890. You do not think so?—I do not think so.

7891. Still people go on following it for 30 or 40 years?—No doubt.

7892. And they do not die very poor?—They do not die very rich, I think.

7893. But whether the price of meat is high, or whether it is low, they do pretty much the same, do they not?—No; when the price of meat is low the butcher does the best, as a rule; that is to say, when it is not over low, but at a moderate price, when he can afford to sell a nice joint at 6 *d.* or 8 *d.* per pound.

7894. If this American meat came in, would the butchers do as well?—I do not know I am sure. Some of them might, but I do not think the retail men would. They do not seem to have done very well with it hitherto.

Mr. *Walker*.

27 June 1877.

Mr. *King-Harman*—continued.

7895. Would the butchers in large trade make as much on American meat as they do at present on foreign cattle that they bring over and slaughter?—They would not.

Mr. *Norwood*.

7896. Do you happen to know what has been the number of foreign animals imported into Hull during the last few years?—I do not.

7897. In your opinion, the import into Hull of foreign cattle, especially from the Continent, has fallen off very much during the last year?—It has I believe.

7898. I have statistics before me, from which it appears that the import of foreign cattle in 1876 was greater than it was in 1872, 1873, and 1874. There were no less than 49,000 head of foreign animals imported into Hull in 1876; does not that rather make you change your view as to a falling off?—I was speaking of the present time.

7899. The Chairman has told you that restrictions were put upon the movement of cattle in the beginning of January, when the plague broke out, and, of course, it was natural that from that period there should have been a falling off in the trade; and you were alluding to that period when you gave your evidence just now?—Yes; since then.

7900. You were not speaking of the past 12 months, but of the six months which have intervened between the beginning of January and the present time?—I was speaking of the six months from January until now, no doubt. I gave up going to Hull a little before this time last year, so that I cannot speak positively; but I believe that it is much less now than it ever was.

7901. If last year 23,000 cattle came into Hull, they could not be consumed in Hull; they went to the West Riding, I suppose?—No, they did not; a great part of them came to London.

7902. From Hull?—From Hull. They were slaughtered in Hull, and sent away by men in Hull as dead meat to London, and to Sheffield, and to Barnsley, and to Manchester, and to Liverpool, and to various places; but Leeds seemed not to be wishful to buy it dead.

7903. If the restrictions were taken off and free importation was again allowed into Hull, I suppose that the Leeds people would have no reason not to go to Hull in that case?—They would go to buy it at Hull alive if they could bring it inland to slaughter at their own place.

7904. Have you seen any of the American live cattle that have been landed lately in Hull?—I did not see them when they were landed; I saw them when they came to Leeds.

7905. What sort of condition were they in?—Very fair indeed. I should say that they came in very excellent condition. I saw last Friday one of the same cattle that were landed in Hull, and it looked well, and it had been landed for a week.

7906. There was a cargo brought by Mr. Wilson's vessel, the "Othello," of New York; did you hear anything about its general condition?—I did not, but I believe I can say that these were part of the cargo.

7907. And they were really fine?—They were very nice.

7908. You would be sorry to see that trade stopped?—I have the greatest wish for them to come alive from all countries except where the plague exists.

Mr. *Norwood*—continued.

7909. You do not wish to be the means of importing plague into this country; but so long as there is no immediate danger of that, you wish to have as much foreign cattle as you can get alive?—Decidedly so.

Mr. *Pease*.

7910. You say that this time last year you gave up buying foreign cattle in Hull?—Yes.

7911. Has your own trade fallen off?—No, my own trade has not fallen off; I then took up the Irish trade.

7912. Have you been purchasing Irish fat cattle?—From last June until December I have purchased Irish fat cattle every week.

7913. Where do you purchase them?—In Leeds.

7914. Are they brought in by the dealers?—Yes.

7915. The quality of those cattle has very much improved of late years, I suppose?—Some of them are of very good quality indeed.

7916. Did you see any disease among those cattle?—I did not.

7917. No foot-and-mouth disease?—No foot-and-mouth disease.

7818. You say that you have been 30 years in Leeds as a butcher; are you well acquainted with the district about Leeds; have you bought extensively of farmers?—Pretty fairly.

7919. Do you know the Wetherby and Borrodale districts?—I do.

7920. Have the stocks held by farmers decreased or increased in your time?—I should think that they have increased.

7921. That is your general impression?—It is.

7922. And you think that they have not been so much alarmed by the prevalence of these diseases as to be prevented from keeping large stocks of store cattle?—Some of them may have been, but, as a general rule, I believe they have not.

7923. Have you ever gone to Hartlepool?—Never.

7924. In your excursions to Hull, have you seen many foreign beasts landed and going inland for the purpose of being fed or finished in England?—Not so many.

7925. But you think that some of them do?—Some of them perhaps do.

7926. Are they bought by farmers and graziers?—Yes; they were chiefly in-calvers.

7927. Not fat beasts?—No, they were chiefly in-calvers.

7928. Do you think that many of those in-calvers have gone into the West Riding, into the dairies?—Some of them have.

7929. Would you say that they were principally left in the neighbourhood of Hull?—Yes.

Colonel *Kingscote*.

7930. You say that during an experience of 30 years as a butcher, the price of meat has increased very considerably?—It has.

7931. Do you think that the consumption per head of the population is more or less?—I should think that they buy more per head.

Mr. JAMES ODAMS, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

7932. I BELIEVE you have been deputed by the Central Chamber of Agriculture to give evidence before this Committee?—I have.

7933. I think that you gave evidence before the Committee of 1873?—I did.

7934. And before that Committee you were examined at some length upon the import of foreign animals into this country, and as to their slaughter at the port of landing?—I was.

7935. Have you considered the question since the time you gave evidence then?—I have considered it, and I am still of opinion that slaughter at the port of debarkation is the right thing.

7936. You have always advocated, and you now advocate, that the foreign trade should be only permitted with the restriction of slaughter at the port of embarkation?—I think that all animals coming in the holds of vessels should be slaughtered at the port of debarkation.

7937. Is that on account of the difficulties which you see in the inspection of vessels at the ports, and the consequent liability to disease being carried into the country if the animals are allowed to circulate through it?—I believe that disease is developed, I will not say generated, in the holds of vessels; and I think that all animals which come in the holds of vessels are not fit to mix, and never ought to mix, with the English stock, or to travel through the country.

7938. You think that the inspection at the ports would not be sufficient to guard you against the spread of disease?—Since 1865, we have had inspection, disinfection, and deoderization; and we have also sent cattle to various ports, for instance, to Harwich and to Deptford, and also to the Metropolitan Market; and I think that the last case of the "Castor" coming in is sufficient proof that inspection is not at all safe.

7939. You think that that would still be the case, even if you saw a probability of greater restrictions being adopted abroad in order to prevent a recurrence of what happened in the case of the "Castor"?—I scarcely see what additional restrictions they can put on abroad. In Germany, I am told that immediately a case of cattle plague breaks out, the soldiers are called out and a cordon is put around; we have had cordons around London during the time the cattle plague was here, but I think if you remember that notwithstanding that we had a cordon of a strong body of police, calves and other things were moved out of the circuits in mourning coaches and hearses; and, in the recent cordon which has been established around London, I can tell you that there are men who are called blockade runners, who have taken bullocks through the cordon, and taken them into the country.

7940. What you represent is that where a cordon is drawn round a town, as it has been around London, merely by a line of inspectors, it is impossible to prevent the smuggling of animals taking place?—I fancy so.

7941. Has your attention been called to what was put before us in evidence by the witnesses from abroad; that the intention of the foreigner, in Germany especially, is to draw a zone around his frontier, and to oblige all animals to pass that zone on foot so as to enable, as they describe it, a proper inspection to take place?—I have not very great faith in inspection; I have seen it for many years. With regard to what you alluded to in respect to the German cattle, I may perhaps mention to you a circumstance which occurred in the recent outbreak of cattle plague, whereupon Professor Brown, I believe, telegraphed to Newcastle. You have had a gentleman from Denmark here, and I think he stated also that there was little or no foot-and-mouth disease there.

Chairman—continued.

7942. The gentleman from Denmark represented that there had not been, but with one exception, a case of the introduction of foot-and-mouth disease from that country here, and that was this year; I think seven beasts were affected?—Yes; that was on the day that a telegram arrived stating that the "Castor's" cargo contained animals affected with rinderpest. The same telegram also conveyed the intelligence that some cattle were gone to Hull. The authorities at the Privy Council telegraphed to Newcastle to use additional precautions, as there was some fear that they might have got to Newcastle. That telegram was sent; and upon a re-inspection of those cattle at Newcastle, several of them were found to be affected with foot-and-mouth disease. Several of the animals that had recently been inspected were sent into the market as free from disease, and upon reinspection, they were found to be affected with foot-and-mouth disease. Those were Danish cattle. The market was closed.

7943. That was the cargo which has been spoken of as coming from Denmark?—Yes.

7944. Your faith in inspection is no greater than it was when you gave your evidence before?—No; it is very much shaken.

7945. It is on that ground chiefly, as I understand you, that you would urge the slaughter of animals at the port of debarkation?—It is.

7946. Have you considered the question with regard to the Danish and Spanish trades?—All cattle that come in the holds of vessels, where disease is to my mind developed, should be slaughtered on landing.

7947. Can you give the Committee any information with regard to the decrease of the home stock in this country?—I have the agritural returns published by the official authorities, and it appears from them that the stock in England has considerably decreased. The number of cattle in Great Britain in 1876 was 2¼ per cent. less than it was in 1875.

Mr. *Pease.*

7948. Can you give us the number?—I have not the number of cattle; they are in the Returns.

Chairman.

7949. You have made those calculations on the Agricultural Returns?—I have. They were 4½ per cent. less in 1870 than in 1874.

7950. To what do you attribute that decrease?—As it principally occurs amongst young cattle, it must be very evident that our producing powers are diminishing; that we are not producing the quantity of stock that we did.

7951. And that the land is being turned to arable purposes instead of to the breeding of stock?—

Mr. *Odams.*

27 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

stock?—I will not say that; I do not know whether we have more land under plough now than we had five or six years ago; but the farmers do not keep the number of stock per acre that they did, I think.

7952. They do not place a sufficiency of stock on the land, or so much as the land would carry?—No.

7953. And the breeding has, in your opinion, from these Returns, fallen off in the last two years 4½ per cent.?—Yes, according to these Returns it has.

7954. To what do you attribute that?—To the apprehension of these diseases; there is not the same security for breeding that there used to be.

7955. Do you put that dread down entirely to the importation of disease from abroad?—No, not altogether. I think we have a great many diseases for which we are in some measure responsible at home.

7956. I suppose you refer to pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease?—I do.

7957. As representing the farmers, do you think that, looking to those diseases as being developed to a great extent in this country, the farmers would be willing or anxious to submit to restrictions for the purpose of getting rid of these diseases?—I may say that I mix with a vast number of farmers from all parts of England, and I am quite sure of this, that any reasonable restrictions, or almost any restrictions, that might be imposed, they would gladly submit to rather than have these diseases, I may say, weekly distributed amongst them by foreign cattle.

7958. It has been represented by several witnesses that, although the farmers might be willing to submit to certain additional regulations, the strict regulations which, as Professor Brown suggested, would be necessary for stamping out foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia, would be resisted as being worse than the continuance of the disease; that is not your opinion?—I am sorry to say that I differ from Professor Brown entirely. From all the information that I can gather from respectable farmers, they tell me that they would bear any restrictions so long as they did not have these diseases brought amongst them by foreign animals.

7959. As representing the Chamber of Agriculture, you think that that would be submitted to?—I do.

7960. The Chamber of Agriculture is a representative body, representing the farmers generally throughout the country, is it not?—Yes; it consists of some 48 chambers, I think, from different parts of the country.

7961. It is the centre of the different local Chambers of Agriculture?—Yes.

7962–3. And the representatives of those local chambers express the opinion which you, on behalf of the central chamber, represent here to-day?—I do not know that I, perhaps, do not go a little beyond them. I have always advocated slaughter at the port of debarkation; they are not quite united, and some of them think that there should be slaughter at the port of embarkation.

7964. But, as regards restrictions on the home trade, you speak as representing a very large number of local associations of farmers, and you tell the Committee that you believe that the farmers generally throughout the country are willing to submit to strict regulations for the purpose of getting rid of these diseases?—To strict regulations they would willingly submit.

Chairman—continued.

7965. I think you have been long acquainted with the Deptford Market and the Metropolitan Market?—I have.

7966. It has been stated that there is a great difference in the prices at the Deptford Market as compared with the prices in the Metropolitan Market; can you give any information to the Committee upon that point?—I cannot say that I am read up at the moment with regard to those differences; I have not visited either of the markets lately; but I cannot for a moment conceive that there can be any great difference of prices between two markets in such close proximity.

7967. It has been represented here that the difference in price arose from this: that in the Deptford Market there was a restricted trade and no competition, the trade being in the hands of a few people, and that, therefore, the prices ruled low, there being a combination of those people; whereas in the large market of Islington, where you have a greater trade, there was no such combination possible, and you got a fair price; that is not your opinion?—Deptford labours under a disadvantage inasmuch as there is no railway communication to it; and, therefore, I think that Deptford is at a great disadvantage for supplying districts in the interior of the country. The price which animals fetched when I had a wharf on the river-side was often much greater than the price which they fetched at the Metropolitan Market; and I believe that if you put Deptford upon fair terms with the Metropolitan Market, and let them know when animals are coming, they would have a better chance. The fact of it is, that the trade is so disorganised that it depends upon the ships coming, whether they hold a market or not, there is no regular market-day appointed, and the consequence is, that you neither get a regular supply nor an ordinary demand; you do not get the small buyers, and people of that class down.

7968. The market is held upon the same day as the other market, is it not?—I believe it is, but it is held in the afternoon.

7969. Your opinion is, that if the whole foreign trade were forced into the slaughter market, it would become a certain trade, and that you might by proper regulations increase competition at Deptford, so as to do away with the disadvantage under which the Deptford Market is said to labour?—No doubt. If the corporation will find that accommodation which the trade requires, I have not the slightest doubt that there would be little or no fluctuations between it and the Metropolitan Market.

7970. The present complaints as to prices arise from the uncertainty rather than from the fact of the slaughter?—Quite so. I think it must be palpable that in two markets that are so nearly connected there cannot be a difference of anything like 4 *s.* or 5 *s.* per head in the sheep.

7971. I remember your speaking before the Committee of 1873 as to the slaughter of animals at your own wharf, and as to the large trade which was then done with the manufacturing towns of the north from that wharf in the carcases of animals slaughtered there; that related principally to sheep; did it not?—To sheep principally. I do not remember that there were many bullocks slaughtered for the north.

Chairman—continued.

7972. At that time you stated that carcases were taken freely from London by butchers for sale in Birmingham and Manchester, and other towns?—They were.

7973. Have you any experience whether such a trade as that has continued at all with regard to the Deptford Market?—I believe that certain quantities go to the markets in the manufacturing towns; but, as I said before, they must go at a disadvantage if you have no connecting rail.

7974. Then it is the present circumstances and conditions of the market which lead to its not being so much used as it otherwise would be?—Quite so. I may state, with regard to that, that when that market was established we had an assurance that there should be a railway communication, and accordingly the English producers have suffered themselves to be taxed double toll in the Metropolitan Market at Islington.

7975. Can you give the Committee any idea as to the comparative cost of the transit of live and dead meat?—I have some information upon that point, though not so much as I could wish, because the great carrying railways, the Great Western, the London and North-Western, the Midland, and the Great Northern, have what they term competing points; they run into competing stations, and, therefore, they have a rate which regulates the whole of them. We have no competing rate. These railway terminals are open to all, and they have an arranged rate. In analysing them I find that the cost of the transit of dead meat compared with that of live animals is certainly, I think, in favour of dead meat; but they combine the use of hampers, cloths, and collecting and delivering, which scarcely enables one to judge fairly between the live rate and what we may call the dead rate.

7976. So that it is not any certain figure?—It is not any certain figure. I have also some evidence with regard to freights for foreign meat, and I find that the advantage gained by the foreign meat over the live cattle is something considerable. For instance, the freight of a live bullock from Hamburg to London is 20 *s.*, the four quarters of the animal are 2 *s.* 6 *d.* per quarter, which shows the advantage that a meat trade would be to this country compared, with the live cattle trade, when you look at the difference that it would make in the freight.

7977. Do you believe that it is possible to set up a dead-meat trade from those countries?—I believe that commercial enterprise and science will very shortly develop a meat trade throughout the country.

7978. And that would do away, again, with the Deptford Market?—They are like ourselves, creatures of circumstances; I think the fact of your getting meat here cheaper will be the important consideration.

7979. Have you had much experience of the transit of animals to Deptford as to whether they are brought over in good condition?—I have not lately.

7980. You cannot speak as to whether the animal which is carried alive is deteriorated in value?—I think there can be no question about the deterioration of all animals on board steamers; it must of necessity be so.

7981. From the treatment on board, and from the condition in which they are brought over?—Yes; I am not going to say that there are not

Chairman—continued.

improvements; I believe vessels are much better ventilated than they were a few years ago; but that inhumanity and bad treatment exists there can be no doubt.

7982. That deterioration, of course, strengthens your argument that a dead-meat trade will be a better trade than a live-meat trade?—As I say, commercial enterprise will prove that.

7983. I suppose that if it is so much better a trade, it will practically, by its own weight, drive the other trade away, without taking the more stringent step of stopping it for the purpose of encouraging the dead-meat trade; if it is a trade which commercially must be so much better, it will not want any legislation to encourage it, and it ought to find its own level?—I think so.

7984. That brings in a question which was mentioned in the Committee of 1873, on which I think you gave evidence, and that is the question of the necessity of a supply of offal for the town; if you slaughter on the other side should we be able to get the offal?—With regard to the offal, I would first call the attention of the Committee to how the Americans use their offal. That (*producing a bottle*) is a sample of the offal of pigs from America; there is nothing noxious or particularly offensive in it; it is what they call azotine.

Mr. *M'Lagan.*

7985. Is it used for manure?—It is not used for manure, and I do not know that I should be quite justified in telling you what it is principally used for, not that it signifies to me.

Chairman.

7986. If this dead-meat trade is established as you suggest, how are we to get the offal, on which it is represented that our poor people depend so much for food?—Offal will travel as well as meat if it is brought under proper conditions; and, to convince you of that, I may say that on Saturday last I drove from where I reside in the country, some ten miles, to see the widow of a very large slaughterman, who has been in her place some 50 years; she is now in her 78th year, and I elicited from her how she sent offal to London.

7987. What distance is that?—It is 40 miles from London. I have here her husband's book, of where he used to buy the cattle, and the prices which he used to pay in those days, a quarter of century ago. But I was particular in asking her how she packed her meat and her offal, and for more than 40 years she has sent to market upwards of 200 sheep and pigs a week, never less, with all that pertains to them; and in no case, winter or summer, has she ever lost a shilling by the offal or meat, arriving in bad condition.

7988. That is very much in confirmation of the evidence which you gave in 1873, as to the fact that you had sent offal from your wharf through butchers to Manchester and other towns in the same vans that have carried the meat, and that they have never made any complaint of its not arriving in good order?—That was sent in a very rough state; it was merely put down at the bottom of a truck. This lady (for I may tell you that the slaughterman, of whom I have been speaking, retired with a very large fortune) superintended the whole of the packing; and the offal from this place, Clavering, was put into flats, with a layer of straw between each portion of the meat, and they never had any loss.

 7989. That

Mr. *Odams.*

27 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

7989. That you represent as a trade which has been going on for a great many years?—Yes; I make that statement from what she told me and from the books which she produced to me, and which I have now before me.

7990. And you say that that has been going on with success during that period?—Yes.

7991. Proving that, at all events for that distance of 40 miles, the carriage of offal has been accomplished?—It has been delivered in London perfectly fresh; and I may tell you that it comes up by road and not by rail.

7992. Can you state the time that that would take?—It would take quite eight hours.

7993. Can you speak with regard to the cool storage of meat?—I do not know that I have any practical experience; I go more from what is represented to me; but I see no reason why cold storage should not be provided in our large towns, and why those cold chambers which bring the meat across the Atlantic should not be very much used in populous districts.

7994. You mean that a proper system of cold storage, such as is carried out with regard to American meat, might be established?—Yes. It could be done on land with very much less expense.

7995. And you might in that way bring this offal with a certainty for longer distances than 40 miles?—No doubt. A gentleman connected with the London Cool Storage gave me a plan of his building; in fact I went over them the other morning, and I was pleased to see they were so extensive.

7996. Do you refer to Cannon-street Stores?—Yes; I have here a ground plan of them, and they are very extensive.

7997. That is where the American meat has been sold now for some little time, is it not?—It is.

7998. And by a system of these cool chambers you believe that the dead meat might be kept for a sufficient time in this country to meet the wants of the consumers?—Yes.

7999. I suppose that by means of the same system of cool chambers the dead meat might be carried from the slaughter ports, and distributed through the towns of the country?—Yes, there is waterside communication with the Thames and a railway close adjoining, I believe.

8000. So that that there would be no difficulty even in hot weather in towns in the north having to go to Deptford or Hull for a dead-meat supply?—Not the slightest. I might also add, while speaking of these cool chambers, that there are two vessels now one of which, the "Frigorific," has just come from Monte Video and is expected at Lisbon within a few days; she has taken out a large quantity of meat there, and she is returning with some fresh dead meat to this country.

8001. I understand that that is an experiment which is being made to test the distance which dead meat can be carried?—It can hardly be called an experiment, I think, because it has gone past that; she took out some meat, which arrived in good condition. The cargo of the "Frigorific" comprises 250 head of cattle and 800 sheep. After leaving Campantra she sailed for Buenos Ayres, and then to Monte Video, where she took on board 60 carcases of bullocks, and sailed from there on the 1st of June. She arrived at Rio de Janeiro on the 7th of June, and left there on the 8th for Pernambuco, Lisbon, and Havre. Intelligence is daily expected of her from Lisbon. Up to the time of her leaving Rio de Janeiro all the apparatus had worked with perfect success; the meat on board was in first rate condition, the refrigerators had worked perfectly, and the extreme variation in the room during the whole time had been limited to one degree, viz., from 32° to 33° Fahrenheit. The machinery is found to be perfect, and has answered the expectation of those in charge.

Chairman—continued.

8002. The only thing with regard to that vessel is, that she has started from Monte Video and has touched at Rio de Janeiro, and that during those seven days the cargo remained in good condition, and she is daily expected after a conconsiderable voyage?—Yes, that is all the information with regard to her; but with regard to the other vessel, this is Mr. Mort's patent; it is another patent, I believe. This cargo is now on the passage by the ship "Northam," from Sydney, and comprises the carcases of 500 bullocks and 500 sheep; she has not arrived.

8003. All the evidence with regard to those two ships is, that the experiment has been made with a view of testing the length of journey which these chambers would enable meat to be brought?—Yes; I have very little doubt that it will be a success if they can keep the refrigerator in working order.

8004. I gather that your own opinion is that the dead-meat trade is a trade which will eventually succeed in consequence of this apparatus?—Quite so.

8005. You have had a good deal of experience, I believe, of the London cowsheds?—The London cowsheds, I think, are admitted by almost everybody to be in what you would call a very unsatisfactory condition. I think that perhaps it would be exceedingly hard upon persons who have an interest in cowsheds and who have got a living by them for a number of years, to have them taken entirely away from them; but I think that if they are allowed to remain, it should be under some very stringent sanitary regulations.

8006. If you stopped the import of cattle from abroad, and obliged them all to be slaughtered at the ports, there would be no danger, at all events, of disease coming to the dairies from that source?—There would not.

8007. And therefore, in your opinion, regulations would be all that would be wanted to deal with those places?—I think so; I think we could deal with them.

8008. At present they have been the means of spreading the disease, from the importation of pleuro-pneumonia through Dutch cows?—They have.

8009. Then I may gather that what you would represent to the Committee is, that the alarm on account of the import of these foreign diseases has reduced the breeding of stock in this country; and that if that alarm was done away with, in your opinion, the farmers would turn their attention more to the supply of that article of food?—It would restore confidence to them.

8010. And it would restore, therefore, the supply, which was formerly much larger than it is at present?—Yes.

8011. And you think that the way to inspire that confidence would be to prevent the import of disease from abroad by ordering the slaughter at the

Chairman—continued.

the port of debarkation of all animals from those countries?—Yes.

8012. Irrespectively of the regulations in the countries?—Yes; let them take all the precaution that is possible.

8013. Would you slaughter the animals which come alive from America?—Yes, I would, and I will tell you why I would do it. I think it is now three weeks back that a cargo of some 170 Canadian bullocks (I do not know the name of the vessel in which they came) arrived at Southampton; on their arrival there, the inspector found something the matter with one of them. The purchasers were there, wishing to purchase the animals; but before they could do so, the inspector felt himself hardly justified in passing them, and he telegraphed to the Privy Council in London. I think it was Mr. Cope who went down; Mr. Cope, on his arrival, examined those animals, and he found that one of them was suffering from inflammation of the lungs. I think it requires a very clever man indeed to tell where inflammation of the lungs ends, and where pleuro-pneumonia begins; and therefore I say that all these animals, which must of necessity undergo privations on board ship, never ought to be disseminated among our own stock.

8014. On account of the danger of pleuro-pneumonia coming from America; although the returns have not shown that any cattle have arrived with disease from that country, you consider that those animals should be slaughtered at the port?—I am not aware that there is any pleuro-pneumonia or foot-and-mouth disease in America, but I say that those animals, if they have to undergo these privations, develop diseases of which we know nothing.

8015. And, in consequence of that, you would include what are supposed to be healthy stock in the general restrictions?—I would, from every country; all fat stock.

8016. And you think that the difficulties which have been suggested, of slaughtering foreign animals at the ports, would be got over by the adoption of these methods, and by the fact that the trade, when it is once certain, would be a better trade than it is now with the fluctuations?—No doubt. Since 1865 we have had nothing but confusion and disorder throughout the trade. I have seen the markets at Smithfield vary from 3 *d.* to 4 *d.* per stone on many market-days; but if any of you look at your butchers' books, you will not find that your prices have varied much; but we have had a steady dearness in the price of meat ever since 1865. That I attribute to the utter confusion that the trade has been in during the time that this legislation has been going on.

8017. And you suggest that the remedy for that confusion is to treat the home stock and the foreign stock separately, and to slaughter the foreign stock at the port of debarkation?—That is the remedy that I would suggest.

8018. Is there anything that you would like to say with reference to the importation of Irish cattle?—I think that here, with all due submission to the gentlemen present, who have to legislate for future generations, I might be permitted to say this, that these diseases require active legislation. I am quite sure that we have all of us gone too fast; we have treated these animals not as animals of flesh and blood like our own, but we have treated them worse than we treat our merchandise. Go where you will, you will find that even if a lot of straw is being carried, it is covered up, but an animal is sent to undergo all the variations of this variable climate on its passage without any protection. The whole thing wants reorganising.

Chairman—continued.

8019. You represent that a great deal of the disease which comes in from Ireland might be obviated by better arrangements for the import?—There is no doubt of it. The whole question wants due consideration by the Legislature.

8020. Do you refer to the transit of animals on the railroad after being landed here?—I do. I say that the railroads offer a premium for the inhuman treatment of animals, and I will show you why, because they give you a rate per truck irrespective of the number in it. We know that there are some that come jammed in trucks almost like herrings in a barrel very frequently, and that is one reason why I think some active measures should be taken with regard to that.

8021. You state that they are jammed in trucks; I suppose that there is a certain advantage in that, inasmuch as they do not get knocked about then so much from the jolting and shunting on the railway?—There ought to be a proper distance between them; but the manner in which they come is, I think, simply a digrace to the times we live in, and an outrage upon humanity.

8022. And you represent that that ought to form the subject of any new legislation?—Quite so. I have here a letter from the station-master where I reside at Stortford. On the 21st of March last I came to the station, and I heard a tremendous moaning and bleating, and when I got alongside the platform there were two trucks of calves, animals certainly not six weeks old; one of them was one of the closed trucks below; the other was what you would term a trelliswork truck, or a truck open at the sides. Those animals were going on to Braintree; it was a most bleak morning, hail and sleet, with the wind in the east. They were going a distance of some 18 miles. They had been there the whole of the night with neither bit or drop, and not a bit of straw for them to lie upon.

8023. But the regulations of the Privy Council are such, are they not, that a thing of that sort might come under the notice of the inspector?—The regulations have not been carried out; I do not know what they may be.

8024. You mean that the staff may not be sufficient to carry out the regulations for the proper transit of those animals, although the regulations exist?—Just so. In speaking of this cruelty to animals, I think, as there are many Irish gentlemen on the Committee, I should very much like to be informed how it is that their calves at six months old are not worth as much as ours are at six weeks. It is really what I call neglect and starvation that brings on disease.

8025. I understand you to represent, generally, that you consider that a good many of the evils of these diseases are generated by the mode of transit to which the animals are subjected?—Yes. In the year 1873 I published a little pamphlet upon the cruelties to animals.

Mr. *Arthur Peel.*

8026. When you say that you have always advocated slaughter at the port, you stated, in 1873, that you thought it should be done under certain

Mr. *Odams.*

27 June 1877.

Mr. *Arthur Peel*—continued.

certain conditions; and you mean that to apply to the boats, and the arrangements on board the boats, for the convenience of the beasts?—I stated it, because I thought that those animals, after undergoing what they have done on board those boats, should be slaughtered.

8027. But do you think that they ought to be slaughtered, for fear of their introducing foreign diseases into this country?—Unquestionably.

8028. Are you not of opinion that pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease especially are generated in this country?—Not especially in this country, but I do not dispute that they are generated in this country.

8029. You do not look upon them as international diseases?—No; you must be aware of the number of cargoes that have been condemned, and the animals that have been slaughtered; but we do know that Holland is, I may say, the home for pleuro-pneumonia; and of the Dutch cows, I will not tell you what percentage, but a very large percentage, have pleuro-pneumonia.

8030. But if the foreign live trade was put upon a proper footing, then you would not scruple to admit them?—You cannot put it upon a proper footing so long as you compel the animals to inhale the noxious gases which they must inhale in coming across the Channel; it is contrary to all sanitary science, otherwise we must be spending our money very badly in draining our towns to keep these gases out.

8031. Then you would have them carried on deck?—I would have store cattle carried on deck, but all animals for slaughter should be carried as best they could.

Mr. *Chamberlain.*

8032. You have explained to the Committee why the price at Deptford Market is lower than at Islington Market; are you aware that in the case of sheep, the cost of getting them to Deptford is very considerably more than the cost of getting them to Islington: for instance, I understand that the cost of sending sheep from Antwerp is 1 *s.* 6 *d.* per head to London, and to Deptford 2 *s.* 8 *d.*; from Bremen to London, 1 *s.* 6 *d.*, and to Deptford, 3 *s.* 6 *d.*, being a difference of nearly 200 per cent.; do you know that?—I can carcely conceive how that can be if they come by vessel.

8033. I understand that you would not have Irish cattle slaughtered at the port of debarkation?—Not Irish store cattle, but Irish cattle for consumption I certainly would.

8034. You would treat them exactly as foreign cattle?—Certainly.

8035. Did I correctly understand you to say that there had been a decrease in the stock of sheep in this country, owing to the fear of these diseases?—I cannot tell you altogether what it has arisen from, but there is the fact before us, that we have this decrease in the quantity of sheep.

8036. And you attribute it to the presence of disease?—I attribute it in a great measure to the want of confidence which breeders have, and their consequently not keeping up their stock.

8037. I think you have some interest in the "Chamber of Agriculture Journal and Farmers' Chronicle"?—I have.

8038. You do not agree, I suppose, with a letter which appeared in that journal on the 25th of June 1877, in which a correspondent said that the decrease in the breeding of sheep was caused more by the farmers being short of money, owing to bad seasons and heavy expenses, than to any other cause?—That may be one of the reasons; there is a shortness of money amongst the farmers, no doubt.

Mr. *Chamberlain*—continued.

8039. Your correspondent did not seem to attribute it to the presence of disease?—I am inclined to think that it is partially attributable to that. In looking over this slaughterman's book, I see that 25 years ago, upon many of the farms where he had bought his cattle, he used to get a certain number of calves as well as sheep; and now I know for a fact that there are scarcely any calves bred in that neighbourhood, showing that all these things have tended to prevent farmers going in with that spirit that they used to do to stock their farms, they have lost so much.

Mr. *Jacob Bright.*

8040. I think you said that you would shut out live cattle from America?—I would.

8041. Do you take the view that if you shut out live cattle altogether we should never have any of these cattle diseases in this country?—No, I am not so sanguine as to think that we should not.

8042. You would slaughter the sheep and cattle at the port of debarkation?—All cattle coming for food.

8043. You would admit them to this country?—Certainly.

8044. Then you do not take the view that the cattle diseases that have been so much spoken of before this Committee never could arise in this country?—Oh, no; I do not think you can get perfect immunity from disease.

8045. You think that those diseases may exist in this country, or be created in this country, though we have no connection with the Continent?—My conviction is, that more than three-fourths of the diseases to which cattle are subject are preventible diseases, by humane and proper treatment of the animals.

8046. You spoke of the constant rise in the price of meat since the year 1865, and I think you said that you thought it arose from the confusion caused by legislation?—Yes, in a great measure.

8047. Has there not been a great advance of wages since 1865, and are there not a great many more people able to consume meat now than there were?—Yes.

8048. Do you not think that that may be a considerable cause of this advance in price?—Unquestionably that has a great tendency to it, as well, but you have also increased importation from different parts.

8049. Has not the price increased on the Continent of Europe in many countries in proportion to the increase in England?—I have no doubt that it has.

8050. Would you suppose that that increase has been owing to any confusion of legislation?—I am unable to give you any opinion with regard to the internal regulations of other countries as to their meat supply. I do not profess to know anything about it.

8051. Are you aware that in Switzerland the price of meat during a moderate period of time has doubled?—I should not be at all surprised at it.

8052. So

Mr. *M'Lagan.*

8052. So far as I understand your evidence, it is this: that you do not at all object to the present restrictions upon the importation of foreign cattle provided that the cattle are slaughtered at the port of debarkation?—No.

8053. You would not have live cattle imported into this country from such places as Schleswig-Holstein without being slaughtered at the port of debarkation?—Certainly not.

8054. Then you would have no dairy cows brought into this country?—I think that you probably might receive dairy cows, provided they were isolated at dairies alongside where they were landed, and not allowed to go into the interior, if it were a vital question.

8055. As regards grazing cattle, would you not have them imported?—No; I think no country sends us anything like grazing cattle adapted for our requirements in any such quantity as to make it worth while for us to run the risk. The Danes send us some which, I believe, go to Scotland, but they are not a large quantity, and if they, the same as Irish stores, could come on deck, and never inhale these gases, I do not know that there would be any great objection to receiving them. I am not at all an advocate for stopping one ounce of food from the people of this country in any way; but disease I am dead against.

8056. You think that, by the proper application of science and skill; you would be able to carry dead meat not only from abroad to this country, but from certain parts of this country to other parts?—Unquestionably.

8057. And without any deterioration in the quality of the meat?—Yes.

Mr. *W. E. Forster.*

8058. You have paid attention to this question of the treatment of cattle and the diseases of cattle for many years, have you not?—I have.

8059. How far are you practically conversant with the treatment of cattle at present?—I farm a little. I graze some 30 or 40 bullocks a year, and feed 200 or 300 sheep.

8060. At one time, I believe, you used to have a wharf at which cattle were landed?—Yes.

8061. Have you that wharf now?—No.

8062. I do not know whether you are in trade at all except as a farmer; if you are, does your trade bring you into contact with cattle in any way?—No.

8063. In what way would it do so?—The way that it brought me into contact with them was that I happened to have an unoccupied piece of land some years ago alongside the Thames, with a frontage to the Thames, which I offered to the Corporation of London, as, perhaps, you may remember.

8064. I understand you to say that that wharf, which was so well known by your name, no longer belongs to you?—The wharf that was known by my name as Odams' Wharf, is now used by the agents of the Peruvian Government for manipulating guano.

8065. Is there anything in your trade with regard to manure, or any other portion of your trade, that brings you into special contact with farmers or cattle-dealers?—With farmers, but not specially with cattle-dealers or butchers.

8066. In what way does it bring you into contact with farmers?—When I tell you that I manufacture some 40,000 to 50,000 tons of

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

manure, you may readily imagine that I come into immediate contact with farmers.

8067. Is any of that manure manufactured from the offal of cattle in any way?—None, excepting that we have dry blood which we use; but the blood is used first of all for chemical purposes, and then we get the residuum, which contains ammonia.

8068. Does that dry blood come from slaughter-houses?—Some comes from slaughter-houses from all parts of the world. I had a sample this morning which came from Portugal.

8069. Where are your works?—Adjoining the Victoria Docks, and very near to where the place of landing the cattle was.

8070. How far are they from Deptford?—Across the water I should think it is a mile and a half to two miles.

8071. I understood you to say at the beginning of your examination that you had very little confidence in inspection, and that your opinion was confirmed by the last import of cattle plague by the "Castor"?—Yes.

8072. I understand that it is very much on account of your disbelief in the efficacy of inspection that you think that all animals should be slaughtered at the port of debarkation?—Yes.

8073. Was it not the case that the animals that came in the "Castor" were by law obliged to be slaughtered at the port of debarkation?—They were, but unfortunately a great deal of time was lost in the slaughter, and not only that, but I believe the law would not allow Professor Brown to take that course which should have been taken, viz., to have seized the vessel, and condemned everything belonging to it; but the cattle were landed at Deptford, and the vessel was moored down to Horselydown.

8074. Still the fact remains, does it not, that if all the live animals that were imported from abroad were ordered to be slaughtered at the port of debarkation, you would be merely putting other live animals in the same position as the cargo of the "Castor" were in?—You cannot by any legislation, I think, as I have already stated, get perfect immunity from disease; you must take a certain amount of risk. In the case of the "Castor" this risk was perhaps considerably augmented by the fact that Professor Brown did not go down to see that the cattle plague existed before the orders were given out for slaughtering the cattle. And then it is doubtful to my mind whether we got that cattle plague that went to Deptford from the cattle. It is much more likely, in my opinion, that the vessel going away from her moorings, and having potatoes and hops and other merchandise on board, and people having perfect egress and ingress to that vessel, contagion might occur in that way.

8075. That suggestion of yours points to another precaution besides slaughtering at the port of debarkation; what would be your suggestion to prevent a similar occurrence?—These cattle vessels, I believe, are disinfected and thoroughly well washed down on their discharge, and hitherto it has been tolerably safe, I think.

8076. Do you not think that it is rather an encouraging fact, so far as cattle plague is concerned, that both this year and 1872 it has been stamped out so quickly?—It certainly reflects some degree of credit; I must give the Privy Council the credit of doing what they could on this outbreak; but there is nothing encouraging

in

Mr. *Odams.*

27 June 1877.

Mr. *Odams.*

27 June 1877.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

in stamping it out; the great thing is to prevent it from coming here.

8077. Does it not give some reason to hope that, so far as cattle plague is concerned, what with guarding against its coming here, and what with our measures for stamping it out, there is not that danger of a great spread of cattle plague that there was?—By repeated reverses and by repeated warnings we do get a little more clever.

8078. You were referring to the case of some Danish cattle as illustrating the probability that there was some danger of foot-and-mouth disease from Danish cattle; I think I understood you to say that those were some cattle that were upon the first inspection thought to be free from disease, and upon the second inspection were found to have foot-and-mouth disease?—That was the report.

8079. At what time was the first inspection?—I do not know. I am not at all connected with the cattle trade. I only received this information, I believe, from the authorities at Newcastle. I do not know what time elapsed.

8080. You do not know where the cattle were placed between the first inspection and the second?—I do not.

8081. Nor do you know whether there had been any foot-and-mouth disease lurking about the place in which they were kept?—I do not; and I am inclined to think that it would puzzle anybody to know. The subtlety and insidiousness of these diseases are past all comprehension.

8082. But I suppose you would admit that if at the first inspection no foot-and-mouth disease was found, and if two or three days afterwards it was found that there was foot-and-mouth disease, it would be quite possible that the disease might have been given to the animal after they were landed?—It is quite possible that the disease might have been given to the animals after they were landed, and it is also possible that it may have been in a state of incubation.

8083. You gave us some return with regard to the number of cattle in 1876 as compared with the number in 1875, and I think you stated that there was a diminution in the number of cattle in Great Britain in 1876, as compared with 1875; but, I suppose, you are aware that there is an increase as compared with 1872?—There is an increase in pigs, I think, but I have not got the returns.

8084. From the return in the Agricultural Statistics (p. 118) it appears, does it not, that the number of cattle in 1876 was 5,846,302?—Yes; that is so.

8085. That is a decrease as compared with 1875, when the number was 6,012,824?—Yes.

8086. And also a decrease as compared with 1874, when the number was 6,125,491?—Yes.

8087. But it shows an increase as compared with 1872, when the number was 5,624,994?—Yes, it is a slight increase.

8088. Therefore as one has to judge by longer times than one year, it would appear to me that this fluctuation from 1875 to 1876, is no very great proof of diminution of production?—I do not know that there is very much in the way of reliable data when the animals are so few in number; still we ought to be constantly increasing.

8089. Upon what ground would you expect the increase?—Upon all the principles of progression which we hope for in agriculture.

8090. You expect cattle to increase in number like men and women?—I expect them to increase and multiply.

8091. You would expect the same rule to apply as regards the increase of the number of cattle, as applies in the case of the increase of population?—Quite so.

8092. Does your farming experience enable you to give the Committee any information with regard to anything about the probabilities of the food for these cattle being under such conditions as would be likely to cause an increase or a decrease in the last few years; a good many of the cattle are fed upon imported food, are they not?—Of course they are, to a certain extent; linseed is the principal foreign artificial food which we give cattle in my locality.

8093. I am asking in absolute ignorance myself as to the fact; but has the price of linseed varied much during the last five years?—It has varied. It rose very rapidly upon the outbreak of the war, but it is resuming its natural price now.

8094. Was the price in 1876 a high price?—It has been a high price. I am not a linseed dealer, and therefore I cannot give you the exact data, but I should think that it has varied 7 *s.* or 8 *s.* a quarter during the last six months.

8095. You have probably heard or read the evidence which has been given before this Committee, as to the comparison between the Deptford Market and the Islington Market; I should like to ask you a question or two with regard to the statement so very strongly made by the importers, as to the disadvantage of selling at the Deptford Market rather than at Islington; do you think it is an incorrect statement that, generally speaking, an animal would fetch more at the Islington Market than it would on the same day at the Deptford Market?—I cannot think for one moment with the present state of communication, that there can be anything like the variation which some gentlemen have stated with so short a distance between one market and the other.

8096. When you had your own wharf open, was there much doubt as to whether animals should come to that wharf, or not?—No; the buyers got very well reconciled to it, and the animals made after a little time as much as or more than they would have made at the Islington Market.

8097. I am afraid you did not catch my question. Was there a doubt with regard to the arrangements of the Privy Council Office, as to whether the cattle must or must not come to your wharf; was the importer into this country or the exporter from the Continent, in a state of uncertainty as to whether his cargo was obliged to be landed at your wharf or not?—There was no uncertainty after a time.

8098. Then the disadvantage of uncertainty which some persons think now applies to Deptford, did not apply to your wharf?—There is an equal certainty during the time that the restrictions have lasted of late, that those animals must go to Deptford; the consequence is that they are about upon a par.

8099. It has been stated by some persons that one of the reasons why the Deptford Market is at a disadvantage compared with the Islington Market

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

Market, is that nobody is quite certain as to whether the cattle must go there or not; they have been certain, it is true, for the last two or three months, but it is said, generally speaking, they are not certain, and that therefore the buyers have not accustomed themselves to come to the Deptford Market; can you throw any light upon that matter?—There is no doubt that it is so. A man would not go to the market unless he knew that the animals he wanted were there. There was a great sacrifice which the importers sustained in having these animals sent to Harwich at one time, if you remember. It is not every butcher who can run down so far from his business as to Harwich, to buy a quantity of sheep.

8100. Are any landed still at Thames Haven?—I do not know whether there are or not, but if so, they are very few indeed.

8101. You stated that when the Deptford Market was opened there was a sort of assurance given that a railway would be made; will you tell us a little about that assurance; by whom was it given?—By the Corporation. I do not know that it was absolutely made a stipulation, but that is the information which I have gathered.

8102. That would make a very considerable difference, you think?—It would make a very great difference to the consumers in the Midland districts, unquestionably.

8103. One reason why the Deptford Market is said to be a disadvantageous place as compared with Islington is this: that the butchers who frequent the Deptford Market are in a smaller way of trade, and are unable to take the animals off and keep them for a short time at their own slaughter-houses, and take their own time for killing them; and that unless a man is in a sufficiently large way of trade to have his own slaughter-house at Deptford; he is, in fact, ununable to buy the cattle there; and that consequently there is the disadvantage of the purchase being in a number of small hands, so that they may manage to get the meat at rather a lower price. What have you to say upon that point?—I believe that it is to a certain extent a monopoly at Deptford. The large buyers are the principal men that go down there. In the first place there is the very heavy rent which the corporation charge; and I may say, in passing, that they also charge an enormous rate for landing, viz., 5 *s.* per bullock, which, to my mind, is a serious tax upon meat, which must eventually fall upon the consumer; and more accommodation is wanted by the general body of butchers at Deptford.

8104. Am I to understand from you that the corporation make a heavier charge for landing at Deptford than is made at the other wharves?—I do not know whether it is heavier or not, but where they have got the whole monopoly they might give a little share of it to the public.

8105. But does the corporation so treat the animals that are landed at Deptford that there is any higher charge upon them than there would be at any of the other wharves?—They are not landed at any other wharves now. I may tell you that, before this restriction took place I charged at my wharf the same as they are now charging; but those were temporary erections; they have now a permanent market, and I say that 5 *s.* per head for landing cattle is, to my mind, a very exorbitant price.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

Mr. *Odams.*

27 June 1877.

8106. Take six months ago, when the Dutch cattle were unscheduled and might have come to any wharf in London: was there at that moment a higher charge upon the cattle that came to Deptford than there was upon the foreign cattle that came to those other wharves?—I think I shall be right in stating that the landing and the freight of cattle from Thames Haven to London was about 4 *s.* 10 *d.*; so that they conveyed them some 40 miles of railway for the same money.

8107. Does that railroad belong to the corporation?—No.

8108. Who paid the railway charge?—The wharfingers.

8109. It has been stated before this Committee that the salesman charges a higher commission upon the sale of a foreign animal than he does upon the sale of an English animal; do you know anything about that?—I think he does. It has been always an uniform charge of 5 *s.*, I think, upon foreign animals; salesmen charge 4 *s.*, and it appears rather an excessive charge when you consider that those foreign animals are not worth more than two-thirds of what the English animals are.

8110. The statement made to us was, that they charged 8 *s.* upon the foreign animals and 4 *s.* upon the home animals?—Then it must include the clearing charges and some other charges; but I am not capable of giving you any reliable information as to the charges.

8111. In 1873 I gathered from one or two of the answers that you gave, that you were of opinion that pleuro-pneumonia (you were speaking with regard to Dutch cattle, but I suppose it would apply to all cattle) was brought on from the climate and from constant exposure to moist earth at the place of grazing; is that still your opinion?—Yes, that is my opinion; and lung disease in Ireland too.

8112. Then you are one of those gentlemen who do not consider that pleuro-pneumonia is entirely owing to contagion, but you think that it may be, to some extent, spontaneous?—I do not know about its being spontaneous; I think it is brought in, as I have already stated, from cattle grazing in low marshy districts, and inhaling the miasma from the earth.

8113. I mean spontaneous as compared with its being infectious from other animals?—Quite so.

8114. I think you made the same remark with regard to foot-and-mouth disease: that you thought it might be brought on by bad treatment, or by bad conditions of living?—I do think so.

8115. If you are right, the mere stoppage of all foreign import, or the slaughter of all foreign animals at the port of landing, will not entirely free the country from disease?—No; I think that the diseases which we have may continue to a certain extent, but we shall be reducing the risk to a minimum.

8116. Have you often inspected cargoes of Irish cattle that have arrived?—I have seen them at the Bristol Market.

8117. I suppose that they do not come in any better condition than the cattle from the Continent?—I believe the boats have a little more room and a little better ventilation, and the passage not being so long, the cattle do not, generally speaking, arrive in such bad condition.

8118. Where do they come from generally to Harwich?—From Rotterdam to Harwich.

 8119. Is

Mr. *Odams.*

27 June 1877.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

8119. Is the passage from Rotterdam to Harwich longer than the passage from Waterford or Cork to Bristol?—It is about the same, I should think; but I can scarcely give you the distances at the moment.

8120. But I understand you to say that you would have the same restrictions and regulations with regard to the Irish import as you would have with regard to the continental import?—Yes, as regards Irish fat stock.

8121. A good many animals come into London by railroad, do they not?—Yes, Irish stock do.

8122. Do they not often come in with disease? I have no doubt that they do.

8123. What would you do with regard to those animals?—All fat stock from Ireland I would have slaughtered at the port of debarkation.

8124. With regard to animals coming up, say, from Aberdeen, or from some part of Scotland by railroad, what would you do?—Those animals are, generally speaking, very healthy, and there is no reason why they should not come into our metropolitan market, and there be sold.

8125. Taking the average of the cargoes that come from the Peninsula, and that are landed at Southampton, would you not say that 20 or 30 cattle coming from the Peninsula will, generally speaking, be in fully as healthy a state as 20 or 30 cattle coming from Ireland, or coming up by railway from Scotland into the Islington Market? They may be, but I have seen cattle from the Peninsula with foot-and-mouth disease as bad as I have ever seen any foreign cattle.

8126. And I suppose you have seen home cattle as bad?—I have never seen home cattle so bad as I have seen cattle from Oporto; I think those were the worst cases.

8127. When was that?—I think that that was in 1871 or 1872.

8128. Did you go down on purpose to look at them?—I did. We had information from Oporto that two or three had foot-and-mouth disease; when they arrived there were some 30 of them; and on the following morning, I think, the whole lot fell with it.

8129. That was a specially bad case, and you went down to look at it?—I was specially interested in having a look at it, because it came on so violently.

8130. I hope that you are not of opinion that the suffering by railroad has not been to some extent diminished of late?—I do not think it has. I believe that the present regulation with regard to the cleansing of trucks has done some amount of good; but I say now that the whole system wants re-organizing. It is a violation of Nature's laws, and so long as you violate them so long will you have dear meat.

8131. You are aware, are you not, that the present Government have carried out the recommendation of the Committee of 1873 in appointing inspectors to see how far the railroads comply with the regulations?—Yes, that is as far as the sanitary regulations go.

8132. But it also applies to regulations with regard to treatment, especially with regard to

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

overcrowding, as to the trucks being provided with spring buffers, and not carrying sheep freshly shorn, and many other regulations of that kind?—Not covering them up is what I complain of.

8133. Have you made it your business, or have you taken sufficient interest in the matter to try to find out whether things are any better than they were?—They are very much better as regards the state of the trucks. Throughout England, wherever I go, I notice a very re-remarkable improvement with regard to the cleansing of trucks; but the adaptation of trucks for carrying animal is not what it should be.

8134. You are aware that some years ago we issued a regulation that there should be a watering-place at every station; do you think that that has been carried out?—I do not think that it has. I still think that cattle are conveyed in trucks without food and water for many more hours than they ought to be.

8135. Do you think that it is that they do not give them water, or that there is not the water for them to get?—There is not the water for them to get, at many stations.

8136. With regard to the private slaughter-houses in London, do you think that they are diminished in number?—I am unable to say what relative proportion they bear now to what they did a few years ago.

8137. Then I gather that your recommendation is, that all foreign fat animals should be killed at the port of landing?—Yes.

8138. Do you recommend that the store animals should be quarantined?—No.

8139. What would you do with the store animals?—I say that store animals come in so small a number that there might be the usual quarantine of 12 hours, but that they should be compelled to come on the decks of the vessels.

8140. And you would put the Irish cattle under the same regulations as the foreign cattle?—The Irish store cattle I would put under the same regulations as store cattle from any other country; but the Irish fat cattle should be slaughtered at the port of debarkation.

8141. You would put them in the same position as the continental cattle?—In the same position.

Chairman.

8142. With reference to the question of watering, a statement has been put into my hands that since the Privy Council made the regulation they have enforced it at all the principal stations, in fact at all the stations where cattle are likely to pass; are you aware of that?—They run by them and the cattle do not get the water.

8143. Do you state from your own personal knowledge that there are such stations?—I cannot point out to you any station now.

8144. It would be useful to the Privy Council if you would inform them upon that point, if you could do so?—I have not acted as a detective, or gone about the country to discover that.

Friday, 29th June 1877.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Major Allen.
Mr. Anderson.
Mr. Assheton.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Cameron of Lochiel.
Mr. James Corry.
Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. Dease.
Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.
Mr. Elliot.
Mr. French.
Mr. King Harman.
Sir Rainald Knightley.
Colonel Kingscote.
Mr. M'Lagan.
Mr. Murphy.
Mr. Norwood.
Mr. Pease.
Mr. Arthur Peel.
Sir Henry Selwin Ibbetson.

SIR HENRY SELWIN IBBETSON, BART., IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. JAMES HOWARD, called in; and Examined.

Mr. *Howard.*
29 June 1877.

Chairman.

8145. I BELIEVE you represent before this Committee the Central Farmers' Club, London?—I was selected by the Committee to give evidence.

8146. And you farm your own property in Bedfordshire, I believe?—I do.

8147. You are a Magistrate for that county, I think?—Yes.

8148. Have you now, for many years, taken an active part on the Executive Committee of the Farmers' Club with regard to the three diseases which are referred to this Committee?—Yes, I have taken a leading part on that Committee, and in other ways also I have taken great interest in the subject of cattle disease.

8149. Your attention, in fact, has long been directed to the question which we are considering?—Yes; I may say ever since the year 1857, when I made a tour of the Continent, and then saw the very great danger that this country was in.

8150. You mean from inspecting herds abroad?—Yes; and from intercourse with distinguished agriculturists in various countries of Europe, especially in Austria in 1857.

8151. And then you entered into the question of the import of diseases from those countries to England?—I took a more keen interest in the matter after that period.

8152. In your own experience as a farmer, have you had any losses from those complaints in your herds?—I have experienced many losses, more especially from foot-and-mouth disease and from pleuro-pneumonia; I have never had an attack of rinderpest. In one summer I lost 40 head of cattle from pleuro-pneumonia, and I have had constant losses from foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia; such losses as would have crippled many an ordinary tenant farmer.

8153. Have you been able to trace to its source the introduction of those diseases into your herds?—They have generally originated from cattle which have been bought at fairs.

8154. Have you been able, when those outbreaks took place, to trace them, in fact, to any particular beasts coming from fairs, or from abroad, or otherwise?—We have not bought from abroad; we have generally bought from fairs in the neighbourhood, and we generally have been able to trace the outbreak to that cause; at all events, we have attributed it to that, and I think with good grounds.

8155. In fact, the disease has come to you from the markets and fairs around?—Yes.

8156. Have those complaints been general in your county as well as in your own herd?—Yes; in one year we had, in the small county of Bedford, 38,000 animals attacked with contagious diseases.

8157. In what year was that?—I think it was some four or five years ago; I forget the particular year.

8158. Was it in 1872 or 1873?—I think it was in 1872.

8159. One thousand eight hundred and seventy-two was the time when the last outbreak of cattle plague occurred in this country?—Yes; I could not charge my memory exactly; but I know that it was four or five years ago. At the lowest estimate it would entail a loss of 60,000*l.* upon the county.

8160. I think you stated that you had no experience of cattle plague itself; but that pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease were what you had suffered from?—I have had no individual experience of rinderpest, but I have seen cases in various parts of the world.

8161. Were the losses of which you have just spoken as occurring in your county, losses from pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease?—From pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease principally.

8162. Cattle plague, I believe, did not reach Bedfordshire in 1872?—No, we adopted very stringent measures in our county at once.

8163. Neither in 1872 nor this year have you had outbreaks of cattle plague?—Rinderpest broke out, I think, in 1865.

Mr. *Howard.*

29 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

8164. But you were speaking just now of great losses which were incurred in the county of Bedford about five years ago, which would be about the date of the last outbreak of cattle plague, when it was brought to Hull, I think; you had no cattle plague then, but those heavy losses which you have described, arose entirely from foot-and-mouth disease or pleuro-pneumonia?—Quite so.

8165. Have you those diseases to any extent, at present in the county?—There is not a single case of contagious disease in any cattle in the county at the present time.

8166. Can you give the Committee any idea as to how those complaints were stamped out in your county, after they prevailed to that extent?—There is no question that they were stamped out by the very stringent regulations which were adopted.

8167. I suppose that all your fairs and markets were prohibited during the time of that outbreak?—Yes.

8168. And the places were made infected places?—Yes, they were declared infected places, and no cattle were allowed to be unloaded at any railway station within the county. Of course they could pass through by railway, the Act settled that.

8169. Can you state how long it was before those restrictions effected the stamping out of the disease, and were therefore relaxed?—We have never got rid of foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia until the present year, when the Cattle Plague Regulations were put in force; but the same effect was produced, I think, in the year 1865, at the former outbreak of cattle disease.

8170. But, confining yourself to the outbreak of 1872, in which you have described the great extent of those two maladies in your county, and also the strict regulations which were adopted for the purpose of stamping out the disease, you say that they did not really stamp it out until still more stringent regulations came in force in the recent outbreak?—Certainly.

8171. Have those regulations diminished the disease in your county?—Very considerably.

8172. Although it was still continuing in certain parts of Bedfordshire, it did not exist by any means to the same extent that it existed in 1872?—No; I had an interview with our chief constable on Monday last, and he told me that during the seven years that he had been in office, he had never been able, until the last month, to report a clean bill of health.

8173. And that, you represent to the Committee, arises from the fact that the restrictions which were enforced when the cattle plague broke out in January last had been so severe as to effect the stamping out of the other diseases?—Yes.

8174. I understand you to say that you can speak also with regard to the outbreak of cattle plague in 1865?—When the cattle plague regulations were then put in force they had the same effect, and then the county was cleared of contagious disease in the same way.

8175. Did it remain clear for any length of time?—No, we soon had the foot-and-mouth disease.

8176. You reimported the disease, as you would say, into your county?—It was reintroduced, at all events.

Chairman—continued.

8177. Are you able to speak as to the amount of stock which is bred in your county now as compared with the amount that used to be bred there in former times?—That is a very difficult matter to ascertain, and one can only speak generally upon a question of that sort, but there is no doubt that these contagious diseases do very much diminish the breeding capabilities of the country, for, as I have no doubt it has been pointed out to the Committee before, they produce, in the first place, abortion, they produce barrenness, and they produce loss of milk, and, of course, besides that, they reduce the number of mothers throughout the country. I believe that but for the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act 1869, although it has its deficiencies, the breeding capability of the country would have been much more seriously affected than it is at present.

8178. You think that the Act of 1869 has, to a certain extent, protected the herds?—Notwithstanding its defects it has done an immense deal of good. It is a subject which I pressed the Duke of Marlborough to deal with when he was in office in 1866; I pressed it upon him to deal with these attacks of pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease, which are far more insidious than cattle plague. There is no doubt that disease is a very important factor or element in the production and price of meat.

8179. I understand you to say that you believe that the supply to the consumer has been very much diminished in consequence, not only of the losses by disease, but of the smaller amount of cattle that have been kept for fear of those diseases?—These diseases, as every member of the Committee must see, are deterrent; farmers who have suffered serious losses are naturally deterred from keeping on with the system which entails upon them such very serious losses, and many have adopted the plan of buying in their store stock instead of breeding. That has been done to a very considerable extent. Many farmers who used to breed and rear cattle have abandoned that practice for the comparatively safer plan of buying in their store stock.

8180. The risk, in fact, is less; they have the cattle for a shorter time upon their farms, and therefore the risk is diminished of this disease breaking out before they can get the cattle into the market?—Yes; and not only that, but the danger and loss are much greater with milch kine than with neat stock. They prefer to buy store stock instead of breeding, and, of course, that has diminished the stock of the country. Of course, the change has been a very good thing for Ireland; Ireland has reaped a rich harvest in consequence.

8181. I understand you to represent that it has diminished the productive power of the country, because it has diminished the number of farms on which the breeding of cattle has been carried out?—Very seriously. Then many farmers have preferred the production of mutton and wool to beef, because of the lesser risks which are incurred, and the prices of mutton and of wool have been more remumerative than the prices of beef.

8182. Do I correctly understand you to say that the number of sheep kept on farms has risen, whilst the number of cattle has diminished?—No, I do not say that, because other causes have been in operation. For instance, owing to the

Chairman—continued.

the high price of mutton, many farmers have been tempted to sell the ewe lambs and even their ewes, believing that at certain periods they would never be worth so much money. I will give you an instance: I was vexed with my own bailiff two or three years ago for selling my ewe lambs without my knowledge, and when I asked him why he had done so, his reply was, "Sir, they will never be worth so much money," forgetting the ulterior consequences of that course. Upon inquiry, I find that it has often been the case, owing to the very high price of mutton and lamb, farmers have been tempted to sell their ewes and ewe lambs, and I attribute the decrease that has taken place very much to the operation of that cause. Still, I think, relatively, the production of mutton and of beef has not gone on in the same proportions, and that mutton has been produced in larger proportions than beef.

8183. From the causes which you have described as affecting the breeding of cattle?—From that amongst other causes. Notwithstanding the present condition of the trade, there is no question that from 10,000,000 to 11,000,000 of home-produced sheep were slaughtered last year.

8184. Do you believe that the feeding capabilities of the country would enable farmers, if they felt that security existed, to increase the number of cattle on their farms?—Do you mean security of capital?

8185. I mean security against disease and the consequent losses, which have deterred them from breeding?—Certainly; if too there were greater security against disease, the herds of the country would naturally increase.

8186. And you think that the grazing capacity and feeding capacity in the country would allow of a larger number of animals being produced?—There is no doubt that a larger number of stock could be produced; but the live stock of the country cannot be produced at pleasure, as some previous witnesses seemed to imagine. As many members of the Committee know, I have not only a farm, but I have a factory, and I find that the production of a farm cannot be extended in the same way as you can extend the production of a factory. The agency of mothers is indispensable in bringing animals into the world, and they cannot be indefinitely increased. I can build a fresh wing to my factory, but if I want to increase the number of animals upon my farm, independently of the question of capital, it is a slow process.

8187. It takes time, in fact, to establish a greater breeding capability in the country than at present exists?—Clearly; I think that must be obvious.

8188. I daresay you have had your attention directed to what was stated to this Committee by Professor Brown, viz., that although farmers were fully alive to these diseases being brought into their herds, yet he thought that the restrictions that would be absolutely necessary in his opinion to stamp out the disease would be so intolerable, that the farmers of the country would never put up with them. Is that your opinion, speaking on behalf of the Farmers' Club?—On the contrary, I believe that if they could be assured against the re-introduction of disease, they would submit to more stringent regulations. I may say that the trouble throughout the

Chairman—continued.

country has not been with the farmers; they have conformed to the regulations adopted by the various counties and local authorities, and I think that to a very great extent they have cheerfully acquiesced. The trouble has been with dealers and salesmen and middle men generally.

Mr. *Howard.* 29 June 1877.

8189. Even if restrictions were imposed generally throughout England, and the fairs and markets were all stopped, with a view of stamping out pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease, you believe that the farmers throughout England would, with the object of stamping out the disease, put up for a considerable time with such restrictions?—I do; but I would add that of course there is a conviction in the minds of farmers that after having obeyed all these regulations and complied with all these restrictions, the disease will be again re-introduced, or re-imported as you said just now; and of course they are impatient under restrictions which harass but do not give them the needful protection against the reintroduction of the disease.

8190. That implies the opinion, then, that supposing we could stamp it out in this country, the only chance of its re-introduction would be by its being brought from abroad?—That is my opinion; in respect of contagious diseases I believe in the germ theory.

8191. You do not think that there is any probability, either from bad treatment or from feeding animals in unhealthy situations, of pleuro-pneumonia or lung complaint being produced spontaneously?—I do not, and I think the experience of the past warrants us in coming to that conclusion. When I was a boy the cattle used to be driven up by road from Leicestershire and Derbyshire and through Bedfordshire. That mode of transit, one would imagine, was far more likely to produce disease than travelling in a railway truck. These droves of animals used to come up dusty and hot and footsore, and I have seen many of the bullocks drop from exhaustion; but we never had foot-and-mouth disease in those days. Farmers bought their cattle at a fair, and never thought of putting them in quarantine; but now no prudent man never thinks of buying cattle without putting them in quarantine.

8192. Would you supplement that by stating what time you are speaking of?—I am speaking of the time when I was a boy; from 1830 to 1840.

8193. That was during the time when no foreign animals were imported?—Yes. Again, I think we are warranted by the silence of the old veterinary authors upon either foot-and-mouth disease or pleuro-pneumonia in the assumption that they have been introduced into this country from abroad.

8194. One of the severest outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease, I think, was before the import of foreign animals was allowed?—Yes; but there is no proof that it was generated in this country.

8195. You believe that even then it was brought in, as has been suggested, either by ships' stores, or in some way of that kind?—I think that the evidence points in that direction, because these diseases are known to have existed on the Continent, and they did not exist in England, except very occasional outbreaks indeed.

8196. In your opinion, as a practical farmer, the

Mr. *Howard.*

29 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

the mere fact of the climate or the influence of particular pasturage would not in itself generate pleuro-pneumonia in this country?—I do not think so at all. I hold to the general principle in contagious diseases, that it is spread by germs, and by germs only; and that the different germs possess a greater or a less amount of vitality.

8197. That being your belief, supposing the foreign import of animals to be prohibited, and the security which you anticipate thus obtained, do you believe that the farmers would be quite prepared to submit to any restrictions which they were told and which they felt could stamp out the home diseases?—If they were so assured I have no doubt that they would submit to any such restrictions.

8198. We had a witness before us at our last meeting, Mr. Soulby, who represented the Chamber of Agriculture in Yorkshire, and who stated that, with regard to Yorkshire farmers, he did not believe that they would be prepared to submit to the restrictions for a year with a view of stamping out the disease; but, as I understand, you are not of that opinion?—In the first place, I do not think that a year, or half a year, would be necessary; I think that a much shorter time would be sufficient. I have not read the evidence, but I should suppose Mr. Soulby meant that the farmers would not submit to such restrictions if they believed that the disease would soon afterwards be re-imported.

8199. The witness was examined as to whether, if the foreign trade were stopped, the farmers in Yorkshire would submit to these regulations, and he said that they had already had enough of regulations under the restriction of the present year, and that he did not believe that they would be willing to put up with the stoppage of all fairs and market for a year, or with restrictions for anything like that time, and with a view of stamping out the home complaints; you do not concur in that view?—I can only state my own opinion; I have a very extensive acquaintance with farmers in various parts of England, and keep up, on public questions, a very voluminous correspondence with them, and I have come to an exactly opposite conclusion; further, I know there is a very general opinion existing in the minds of farmers that these regulations are of no use, so long as the certainty of the re-introduction of disease exists. That is why the restrictions are harassing, as they do not provide the necessary security.

8200. Should the stopping of foreign import, in your judgment, apply to cattle coming from all foreign countries, or would you make a distinction in the case of such countries as Denmark and Spain and Portugal, from which these complaints have not been introduced?—That depends upon another question, viz., whether all the animals coming from abroad are to be sold at one or at separate markets. I think that the whole question hinges upon that. So long as foreign cattle are mixed up with English cattle, I would continue the system of scheduling countries.

8201. Should there be separate markets for the foreign as against the home stock, then you think that the countries that could give us fair security that they had a clean bill of health, and could show us that their regulations were as strict or stricter than our own, might send their cattle here for slaughter?—Yes, for slaughter at the

Chairman—continued.

port of debarkation; that is to say, fat cattle; we are speaking of fat cattle.

8202. We are speaking of fat cattle from Denmark, Schleswig-Holstein, and Spain and Portugal, from which countries animals come in large numbers, and in which countries the evidence before this Committee has shown that for very many years they have not had cattle plague, nor yet pleuro-pneumonia or foot-and-mouth disease, to any amount?—I would not impose any restrictions which would diminish the supply of meat to the people, but such as were imperative; I state that as a general principle; nor do think that there is any desire upon the part of the farmers of England so to restrict trade; they have cheerfully accepted the principles of free trade; there is no question about that.

8203. All their anxiety is to be protected against countries which cannot give that security from these diseases which they have a right to expect?—Clearly.

8204. Has your attention been called to a subject which we have before us at considerable length, viz., the dead meat trade?—Of course I have taken an interest in the subject, and I was very glad to see that the difficulty of transporting meat across the Atlantic had been to a great extent overcome.

8205. If those conditions, which are said to be possible, can be carried out, and the meat can be successfully brought such distances, do you believe that a dead meat trade will eventually take the place of the live trade in animals?—I think that the tendency seems to be towards the establishment of dead meat traffic as against live meat traffic. Of course very much depends upon the ultimate success of this American dead meat trade, but it appears to me that, with extended experience, there is no reason to doubt its ultimate success.

8206. The conditions in which the meat has been brought over here in perfect order, even in the hottest weather, if universally carried out would, you think, make the trade a success?—Clearly, and I think other countries in their own interests would follow the example of the Americans.

8207. You believe that foreign countries from which the import of live animals was prohibited, would supply us with dead meat instead of live stock?—I did not understand that the question of prohibition had arisen.

8208. We were talking of the introduction of the American dead meat, and you stated that the dead meat trade, in your opinion, could be established with other foreign countries; supposing that your original suggestion were adopted, that countries from which we had not absolute security against the introduction of disease, if cattle have to be imported alive, were treated as scheduled countries, do you think that a dead-meat trade would take the place of the live import?—I think from both classes of country, if I may use that term, both from scheduled and unscheduled countries, it will eventually be proved that it will pay the producer better to send the meat dead than alive.

8209. Have you had any experience of the dead meat trade from the Continent?—No, I have no practical acquaintance with the subject; but of course very much will depend upon the means employed in this country for storing the meat when we get it; and, at the very commencement

of

Chairman—continued.

of the importation of dead meat, I called public attention to the necessity of fitting up stores with the same appliances that they have on board ship, or similar appliances; I think the loss alone of flesh on a voyage which has been attested to by witnesses before a previous Committee will compel producers to adopt the dead-meat trade when it can be done cheaply and safely.

8210. You mean that as the freight is, I suppose to a certain extent less on the dead meat than on the live animal, and as the animals deteriorate in condition when sent over alive, you think that eventually the dead-meat trade will be the more remunerative?—I could not speak as to the deterioration, but I should imagine that the shaking about and discomfort on board-ship very much lowers the condition of the animals. I may mention that I sent home from Algeria this winter five Arab horses; and, although I sent a man to attend to them and feed them, they came home in a very reduced condition, although they had a fine passage. Judging from that, I should imagine that a bullock would deteriorate.

8211. Have you ever considered, with regard to this question, the regulations for the home trade which are in your opinion necessary?—I have. I may say that last year I prepared a paper for the London Farmers' Club (which I represent here) upon the question of the regulations for both home and foreign stock, and upon the comparative supply of the home and foreign production; and, with your permission, I will hand it in. (*The Witness handed in a Paper.*)

8212. What were the regulations that you suggested should be put in force, as compared with the present restrictions?—Of course the obvious one of uniformity in the regulations issued by the different local authorities; that the Orders in Council should be imperative, and apply to the whole kingdom.

8213. You would take away from the local authorities the power of making their sanitary regulations for each district, and you would make it a central order emanating from the Privy Council?—Certainly; and I would, further, put the carrying out of the orders of the Council and the administration of the Act into the hands of the police.

8214. Would you make the police, then, as a rule, the inspectors?—I would.

8215. Would those inspectors be responsible to the local authority, or to the central authority?—They would be responsible to the local authority, that is to say, to the courts of quarter sessions in counties, and to the town councils in boroughs. I may say that in our county we had separate local authorities corresponding to the petty sessional divisions, and they were a comparative failure. We put that business into the hands of the police, and that has worked extremely well.

8216. Through the whole county?—Yes. I may say that I did not at all agree with the evidence of Professor Brown as to an army of veterinary inspectors being needed; I do not think it at all necessary.

8217. You do not think that veterinary and scientific knowledge is necessary for an inspector dealing with these regulations?—If it is put into the hands of the police, with power to call in any veterinary surgeon appointed by the local authority, I think that is sufficient; but I would supplement the police in this way: in each petty sessional division I would have a number of farmers nominated by the magistrates in petty sessions, and those members so nominated in the petty sessional division should be appointed by the court of quarter sessions as members of the executive committee. To those members the police should be instructed to apply for assistance and support, and, in cases of difficulty, for advice.

8218. How would you deal with the boroughs?—In the same way. The police, of course, are under Watch Committees in boroughs.

8219. Would you entirely entrust to the police, then, the decision as to whether the animals were affected or not?—I have said, on the contrary, that they should be assisted by veterinary surgeons appointed by the court of quarter sessions.

8220. Then I understood you to say that it should be at the option of the police to call them in?—Clearly.

8221. Then the police would practically, in the first instance, be themselves the judges as to whether there was disease or no disease?—Yes; but if they were men of sense they would not act upon their own authority. If they knew that it was their duty to call in to their assistance unpaid local officers or veterinary surgeons, they would do so. We have never found any difficulty on that score in our own county.

8222. I understood you to say that you were anxious that the regulations throughout the country should be uniform?—Yes.

8223. And that they should be under the Privy Council as the central authority?—Yes.

8224. But you would limit the power of the central authority to the mere issuing of regulations, whilst you would leave to the police in those localities the carrying of them out; is that your proposal?—Yes; except in the case of a serious outbreak, in which case I would empower the chief constable of the county or borough at once to summon the assistance of the Privy Council officers.

8225. At present the localities work very often through the police; through the police they call in a veterinary surgeon, and between them they certify as to the disease; and in very many instances the regulations were carried out quite differently in the different localities; with the view of obtaining that uniformity which you describe as being necessary, would you strengthen the hands of the Privy Council, by enabling them to see that those regulations were really carried out?—I would not call in the officers of the Privy Council, except in cases of great necessity.

8226. You do not doubt that under those circumstances the uniformity which you think desirable would be obtained?—When I spoke of uniformity, I had reference more particularly to county authorities. The regulations of adjacent counties are very different; they puzzle the policeman, they puzzle the public, and I may say that they very often puzzle the magistrates. That was the idea in my mind about uniformity. When a county is in a normal condition, I would not call in the aid of the Privy Council; but if there should be an abnormal condition in any district, then I think the head of the police, without going to any local authority (because there is a loss of time in doing that, as we have seen in Middlesex), should at once communicate with the Privy Council.

Mr. *Howard.*

29 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

8227. And you would leave the local jurisdiction and the local authority as it is at present, only that you would give them one uniform code of rules for the whole country?—I would. I should like to see the police in the counties and boroughs made one force; but we must speak of existing conditions.

8228. Under existing conditions you think that, if these uniform orders were made imperative, sufficient uniformity in the different districts would be really attained?—Yes. Of course I should like the Act of Parliament to be altered, and the word "shall" introduced, instead of the word "may"; I should like the law to be imperative, and apply to the three kingdoms.

8229. Have you considered the question of compensation with regard to these regulations; do you see any reason for altering the system as at present in force?—I do. I think, when healthy animals are killed in the interest of the public, full compensation should be paid by the public. It is a public matter, and the loss should not fall upon the private owner.

8229.* I understand that you would leave the compensation for a diseased animal that was slaughtered as it is at present, but that animals slaughtered for public protection, as having been in contact with diseased animals, should be compensated for in full?—Certainly; I think that three-fourths of the value is a fair amount of compensation when an animal is diseased; but when a whole herd is slaughtered, clearly in the interests of the public, I think that the loss should not fall upon the private owner.

8230. I suppose you would allow the sale for consumption of the animals that had been brought into contact?—Certainly.

8231. And that would be in diminution of the full cost to the county or to the locality?—Clearly. I think that every inducement should be given to farmers to declare the existence of disease. There is no doubt that there is a good deal of disease concealed, and the Committee will see the reason: a man's credit is often at stake; he has a rent-day approaching; and if he were to go and declare the first outbreak of disease, he probably could not meet his rent, because he could not move an animal; and there are many other reasons.

8232. The inducement is very great, in your opinion, as soon as an animal on a farm sickens, to say: "Well, I will get rid of all these other animals; they are all right now"?—Yes; and I think that the State should not contribute an additional reason to these causes.

8233. And you think that if the inducement were held out of compensation to the full value for the animals which were slaughtered for having been in contact with a diseased animal, the farmer's interest would lead him to declare the outbreak at once?—It would take away the excuse for concealing the fact of an outbreak, and of course the tendency would be in the direction which you have mentioned.

8234. And you do not see any danger in getting a number of unhealthy animals that were not really diseased thrown upon the rates of the county or district?—I think that with very stringent regulations there would be very little disease, therefore very little loss; it is from lax administration and lax regulations that the cost to the county or the cost to the country is incurred.

8235. And you would still leave the carrying out of these regulations in the hands of the same

Chairman—continued.

people who are now supposed to be carrying them out with some laxity?—Yes, for the present. I would not introduce the principle of centralisation until I was compelled to do so.

8236. You think that the uniformity which you admit is necessary could be attained without it?—Yes, with the Act of Parliament being made imperative.

8237. Would you in any way alter the existing state of things with regard to cattle-dealers, so as to obtain a greater command or check over them?—I would. I would have them licensed; they give more trouble in the matter than all the rest of the community put together.

8238. By licensing the cattle-dealers, you think that you would have a check upon them, and that the authorities of the locality would be able, by having the power of withdrawing their license, to keep them under some restraint?—Yes. If they knew that the magistrates had the power of revoking their licenses, they would think twice before they ran the blockade, which they have no hesitation in doing now.

8239. And that, you believe, would be one of the regulations which would assist you very much in stamping out the disease?—I think so. My experience as a magistrate is that we have had no trouble with farmers; all our trouble has been with cattle-dealers and salesmen.

8240. Would you extend that system of licensing to drovers as well as to dealers?—There is a difficulty about that. I would extend it to drovers from public markets; but to say that a farmer should employ a professional drover to drive his cattle to market I think would be rather an undue interference; but I can see no objection to the employment of licensed drovers from fairs and markets.

8241. You think that drovers attached to the fairs, and not labourers on individual farms, should be licensed like the dealers?—Yes. There is a set of men now, who go about to the different fairs and markets, who are always to be found to pick up a job, and I would have those fellows licensed.

8242. In your opinion, a drover plying for hire ought to be licensed?—Certainly. I may say that the opinion is a very general one as to the licensing of cattle-dealers, and more particularly of cattle dealers than of drovers. The Royal Agricultural Society, as Colonel Kingscote will remember, recommended the licensing of cattle-dealers, and stated their reasons for it, some five years ago.

8243. Turning now to the other part of the question, viz., the importation of cattle from Ireland, would you adopt any different system with regard to the cattle from that country from that which we adopt with regard to our home trade?—Not so long as Ireland, and I would include any other of the British Isles, is free from disease.

8244. You think that any regulations or restrictions that were adopted at home should apply to Ireland as well as to England?—Yes, clearly.

8245. And that, under those circumstances, no restrictions fettering the Irish trade would be necessary?—Of course this Irish difficulty, like many others, is a very serious one. I am quite a disciple of Mr. Delahunty, in favour of equal laws for both countries; and seeing that the Irish have the power, which power they exercise,

of

Chairman—continued.

of closing their ports against English cattle, I do not see how they can complain if we close the English ports against their cattle. I would have no restrictions whatever so long as Ireland could present a clean bill of health; but everyone who knows anything of the Irish trade knows that the Acts of Parliament and the Orders of Council have been carried out in a very lax manner in Ireland. Magistrates have fined dealers and others, who, if they did not set the law at defiance, did not obey the law, a mere nominal sum. That was given in evidence before the Royal Agricultural Society, who sent a Commissioner to inquire. I would not impose any restrictions so long as contagious disease did not exist in Ireland.

8246. I suppose you admit that the supply from Ireland is one that is absolutely necessary for the English market?—Clearly; I think that if the duty of clearing the country from contagious disease was thrown upon Ireland itself, they would very soon stamp it out; there could be no more difficulty in stamping it out in Ireland than in England.

8247. But you would propose for Ireland regulations similar to those which you propose for England, and you recommend that the Privy Council, and the officers who represent the Privy Council there, should have the same power as the Privy Council have here, for the purpose of obtaining uniformity in the different districts; and that the police should have the same power for carrying out the restrictions in the localities?—Clearly; I would make the law and practice uniform.

8248. And you think that the same restrictions which we impose here with regard to foreign imports should apply equally to Ireland?—Yes, certainly.

8249. And thus, having brought both parts of the kingdom under the same regulations, you think that cattle might be passed freely as between the two countries?—Quite freely. I would do so not only in the public interest, but in the interest of Ireland itself. We get foot-and-mouth diseases regularly from Ireland, and in consequence there is a suspicion attaching to Irish cattle which lowers their price very considerably. If a man goes into a fair and knows that they are Irish beasts recently imported they are worth so much less money. I remember pointing out in the House of Commons more than once, that Irish beasts were reduced in value from 1 *l.* to 2 *l.* per head, from the suspicion which attached to them of disease lurking in their systems.

8250. And therefore, until those regulations were adopted, you think that, should disease break out in Ireland precautions would have to be taken against it?—Of course I would do nothing in a hurry. Ireland must have due notice before any fresh regulations were imposed.

8251. Those are your recommendations with regard to Ireland, and with regard to the foreign cattle your recommendation is that they should be slaughtered at the port when they came from all countries which could give us a clean bill of health, but you would prohibit them from other countries?—Yes. I think that the country would not submit to the slaughter of cattle at the ports of embarkation, though I have no doubt that that would be the safer plan, because there would be less to fear of conveying the disease by the animals themselves, and there would be less

Chairman—continued.

to fear of conveying it by means of hay, straw, and manure, and by persons going on board those ships in our own ports. But, as I say, I do not think that the country is quite ripe for such a step as slaughter on the ports of embarkation. I am clearly of opinion, however, that in the interests of the community it would be very desirable, so long as these diseases exist upon the Continent, to slaughter all fat animals at the port of debarkation.

8252. With regard to store animals, would you admit them from abroad?—Yes; but I do not think that that is so important a question, but I should have them quarantined.

8253. The number of store animals that we import is not very large, I think?—No, not from foreign countries; we have no official account of the number, I am clearly of opinion, that it would be in the interest of the community, that the fat animals should be slaughtered, because it would not reduce the meat supply. The surplus meat of the world, like the surplus corn, is sure to find its way to England, so long as England is the best market; and whether you adopt one plan or the other, slaughter at the ports of embarcation or debarcation, it will not make any sensible difference in the supply.

8254. And you do not think that the slaughtering at the port will, as has been stated by other witnesses, so diminish the profit as to drive the trade away into other capitals?—Whenever the markets of other capitals are better than the English markets, the surplus meat will go there, as was the case during the continuance of the Franco-German war. The only time in which the foreign supplies were diverted from the English market was during that period. Then the foreign supplies, owing to the great rise in the price of meat, and owing to the increased demand, went there; but, so long as the English market is the best market, the produce of the world will come here, as is the case with all other commodities. They find their way to the best market.

8255. And you believe that the fact of the animals having to be slaughtered at the port will not diminish the profits to such an extent as to drive the trade away from us?—I do not think so.

8256. I understand you to say that, with regard to the store cattle that come in, you would quarantine them?—Yes.

8257. Quarantining has its disadvantages, as I suppose you admit?—Yes; it would be attended with expense, but the animals would be worth more money.

8258. Would you, in any way, mark such animals on their coming in?—I would mark all animals that were intended to be mixed with English cattle.

8259. Would you mark them and quarantine them for a given time, before they were allowed to circulate freely?—If the quarantine was of sufficient duration, I see no necessity for marking them.

8260. Have you formed any opinion as to what quarantine would be necessary, looking to the fact that it is stated in the scientific evidence, that pleuro-pneumonia, one of the diseases which we are afraid of, lies dormant for so many months in the animal, before it develops itself?—I know that pleuro-pneumonia does lie dormant. I had three attacks in succession in one field, and

Mr. *Howard.*

29 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

in different lots of cattle, and my suspicions were aroused, in consequence of their all taking place in one field, that the germs of this particular disease have great vitality. The steps which I took were these: I took all the cattle out of that field, and I did not put any more in until the following spring; I had the gates painted and the hedges brushed, and I have never had a single outbreak of pleuro-pneumonia in that field since. That is some eight or nine years ago.

8261. Previously to that you had recurrences of it?—I had three outbreaks.

8262. Was the interval between them of any length?—Yes, weeks or months. Pleuro-pneumonia is very difficult to deal with.

8263. Does not the fact of pleuro-pneumonia remaining so long before it develops itself, rather make the quarantining of store animals a difficulty? — The number of store animals from foreign countries is very small, and therefore I do not think it would be so difficult; but anything is better than running the risk of contagion.

8264. It has been represented to the Committee that a large number of the store animals are cows which are brought for the dairies?—Yes; Dutch cows.

8265. In those cases the quarantine would not guarantee you against introducing pleuro-pneumonia into your dairy stock, would it?—It would not be an absolute guarantee; but I think that after an animal had been in quarantine for some two months, it would be a guarantee.

8266. You would make the quarantine as long as two months?—I would in the case of milch cows; but only a very limited number come. There is no insuperable difficulty in providing quarantine grounds for a very much larger number than comes to this country.

8267. Would not the cost of quarantining them increase the difficulty?—They would be enhanced in value; that must be put on the *per contra* side of the account. After an animal had been in quarantine, a man would give more money for her than if there was a risk of the germs of disease being in her.

8268. You do not think that the risk of introducing diseases, and the difficulties of quarantining are so great, as to make it advisable to prohibit the introduction of store animals from those countries? — "Prohibition" is an ugly word, and the doctrines of free trade are against it.

8269. But you propose to prohibit fat animals?—I do not propose to do that; We say, "We want all the meat you can send us, only you must kill it at certain ports." That is a very different thing from prohibition.

8270. You would not allow the introduction of animals from foreign countries unless they could give you a clean bill of health, and then they must be slaughtered?—Yes.

8271. But still, with regard to the introduction of store animals, you think that those restrictions need not be severely carried out, but that, with a certain quarantine, they might be allowed to come into the country?—Yes. I at once admit the difficulty of the subject, but I think the advantages are so great that the difficulties ought to be surmounted; and I believe that the difficulties are not insuperable.

8272. And you would make it one of the conditions that they should not be sent into the

Chairman—continued.

home market for sale?— Certainly, until they were quarantined.

8273. Is there any other point that you wish to put before the Committee in your examination-in-chief?—There is a question about the markets. I advocate all foreign cattle being sold at one market, whether from scheduled or unscheduled countries.

8274. I understood you to say that you would separate the home market from the foreign market?—Yes; but I do not think that I stated my reasons. My main reason is this: that, speaking generally, any market to be successful must have a regular supply; it must not be intermittent. If a market is over-stocked one week, and the buyers go down the next week, and there are no beasts to sell, they will not go to such markets. Then I think that the markets should be easily accessible, which Deptford is not.

8275. You represent that if an Order were passed which obliged the slaughter of all animals at the port, and their sale at a particular market, it would cause a steadier trade than the present system, which renders it uncertain whether a cargo, when it comes over, will go to one market or the other?—Clearly. The uncertainty is vexatious to the foreigner; whereas, if they were all landed at one waterside market, the uncertainty would cease, the supply would be more regular, and of course the buyers would be induced to attend that market regularly.

8276. The great difficulty that has been suggested with regard to there being a paucity of buyers at Deptford arises in your opinion, principally from the uncertainty of that market?—Yes, and from the position of it. It is not accessible, and a market ought to be.

2877. The railroad that has been so long talked of ought, you think, to be completed?—Yes. I do not see the Right honourable Gentleman, the Member for Bradford, Mr. Forster, present; the unsuitability of the Deptford Market was pressed upon his attention when Vice President of the Council by myself and others, but I believe that great pressure was put upon the Right honourable Gentleman by the Corporation of London, and he could not have his own way.

8278. However, the Deptford Market exists, and you represent that additional facility should be given to the Deptford Market if it continues?—Clearly; and that steps should be taken, at all events, not to drive the supplies to other places. Of course, I would consult the convenience of buyers as far as possible; but seeing that they are after all, but "dividers," not producers, that is of small account.

Mr. *Wilbraham Egerton.*

8279. I think that you are in favour of putting the same, or very nearly the same, restrictions upon animals coming from Ireland as upon animals coming from abroad, so long as there is disease in Ireland?—In case of contagious diseases existing in Ireland, I would treat her as a scheduled country.

8280. Is it not a fact that a great many store stock come from Ireland into this country?—Yes.

8281. Would you altogether stop the importation of store stock into this country from Ireland?—Certainly. I think it would very shortly work its own cure, because the Irish people would then

Mr. *Wilbraham Egerton*—continued.

then take vigorous measures to stamp out these diseases.

8282. With regard to fat-stock markets, do you think that in no case in any of the large towns should an arrival go into a fat market, and go out again to be sold as a store animal, which is very frequently done, I believe, in markets in large towns; for instance, in case of an Irish animal going into a market, if it is not sold as a fat animal it is bought, perhaps, as a store animal?—I do not think that such a regulation is necessary, except when the country is in an abnormal condition, when there is a great amount of disease about; in that case it might be necessary.

8283. Your reply would apply to all the markets in the country as well as to those in London?—Yes. I think that when disease exists, your regulations, if you are going to stamp it out, cannot well be too strict.

8284. For instance, when foot-and-mouth disease is prevalent, you think that it is undesirable that any animal should go, say, into the Manchester Market, or into the Liverpool Market, and run the risk of being in contact with those animals which may be subject to foot-and-mouth disease, or which may have the seeds of foot-and-mouth disease in them, and that it should then be taken out again and sold to the farmers of the country for other purposes?—I think that it is highly dangerous and highly injudicious and injurious to the interests of the public. When disease exists, the cheapest way is to take the most vigorous means of stamping it out.

8285. Is it your opinion that the best way of stopping disease is to take it when it first breaks out, and to use vigorous measures then?—Clearly.

8286. And you think that after the disease had got a certain head it is almost impossible to stop it?—The more centres of contagion there are, of course the greater the difficulties.

8287. I did not quite understand your recommendation with regard to the regulations and orders in counties and boroughs; supposing that there is a difference of opinion between the authority in a county and the authority in a borough, how would you reconcile that difference? You cannot interfere. It is very unfortunate that there should be a separate jurisdiction.

8288. But you are arguing in favour of one uniform authority?—So far as the Privy Council is concerned, I think that their orders should be imperative.

8289. But is it your opinion, then, that directly a disease of any kind breaks out, whether foot-and-mouth disease or cattle plague, the Privy Council should have the power of reconciling the difference between the two authorities where they are conflicting?—Their Order in Council should be binding, I think, upon both boroughs and counties.

8290. You think that it should be compulsory, in fact, and not permissive?—Certainly.

Mr. *M'Lagan.*

8291. You did not exactly say whether or not you consider that drovers should be licensed?—I said that drovers from fairs and markets should be licensed, but I would not tie up a farmer and say, "You shall have a professional drover to drive your cattle to market;" that I think would be intolerable.

8292. Would it not be attended with con-

Mr. *M'Lagan*—continued.

siderable inconvenience to a farmer if he had to employ a public drover, even from a market; for instance, he sends cattle into the market with his own man, and it would be more convenient for him to send any cattle that he might buy in the market home again with the same man?—I did not say that a farmer should be compelled to employ a licensed drover; that, I think, would also be intolerable; what I suggested was, that men who make a trade of going from fair to fair and market to market should be licensed.

8293. You would not compel anyone buying cattle in a public market to send his cattle home by a licensed drover?—Clearly not; I should rather take my own man if I had him there.

8294. As regards the importation of lean stock, I see great practical difficulty as to quarantine?—So do I.

8295. Perhaps you could clear up the difficulties a little?—In the paper which I have handed in, I have set forth in some measure the difficulties, but the great difficulty would be in respect of Ireland, and probably the Channel Islands. But I would throw the work of stamping out disease in Ireland upon Ireland itself.

8296. I am speaking of the importation of lean stock from all countries, from Ireland as well as from other countries?—I mean lean stock generally. I think if it were once said, "Now then, so long as contagious diseases exist in Ireland, your cattle shall go into quarantine," they would very soon adopt the most vigorous measures for stamping it out; but so long as the expense falls upon England, they will not take the most vigorous measures; and we have seen in this recent outbreak how very easy it is to stamp out foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia.

8297. Your evidence tends to this: that we ought to have uniformity of regulations as much as possible?—Certainly.

8298. As Ireland is a part of the United Kingdom, do you not think that the regulations for cattle there should be under the Privy Council in England as well as the regulations in this country, and not under the Privy Council in Dublin?—I said so in answer to the Chairman. I would not take away the power which is now vested in the Privy Council of Ireland to shut their ports against English cattle.

8299. Then you would have a double authority?—I would not take away from Ireland the power which she has in that respect; she has it now, and exercises it.

8300. But why should you give Ireland more power than Orkney or Shetland in shutting her ports; it is part of the United Kingdom?—It is; but it is a more populous country, and Ireland is rather more difficult, as you are no doubt aware, to satisfy.

8301. Are you aware that very stringent regulations existed in Ireland during the prevalence of the rinderpest?—Yes.

8302. And are you aware of the results of those restrictions at that time, not only in Ireland, but in regard to the Irish cattle imported into this country?—Not practically.

8303. You do not know what was the effect at that time upon the dairy cows in Dublin and the neighbourhood?—I do not. I know that in some parts of Ireland they have never had foot-and-mouth disease, and these are the parts of Ireland in which the farmers are exporters and

Mr. *Howard.*

29 June 1877.

Mr. *M'Lagan*—continued.

not importers. They send their cattle away from some of those remote parts of Ireland, but they never bring any back again, and they have been entirely free, and that has been the case in other countries as well.

8304. Are you aware that there are certain parts in the Highlands of Scotland where they have had no foot-and-mouth disease, and no pleuro-pneumonia?—Yes, I had that in my mind, but these are exporting districts too.

8305. Therefore you would be inclined to argue from that that those diseases are really imported from abroad?—It does not quite touch that question, but it shows that the diseases follow the line of traffic, as a rule.

8306. It has been stated in evidence that it would be impossible to introduce the dead-meat trade from the Continent, on account of the kind of cattle that would be slaughtered on the Continent and sent over here; as you have paid a great deal of attention to that subject, both as regards the quality of cattle and the slaughter of cattle, perhaps you will give the Committee your opinion upon that point?—I know it is stated that Continental meat is leaner; they would probably feed it better, and perhaps improve the breed, by the introduction of our own cattle; but I really do not think that there is any reason why they should not send such animals as I have seen in Belgium, Holland, Germany and other countries in the form of dead meat. I think that the difficulty has been magnified. Of course, good thick meat would be likely to present fewer difficulties than thin stuff.

8307. What, in your opinion, would be the effect of the importation of large quantities of dead meat into this country, not only from America but from other parts?—It would reduce the price, to begin with.

8308. Would it have the effect of preventing the importation of live stock?—Clearly, if they send the animal in a dead form it cannot come alive.

8309. Do you think that the consumers of this country would be as well off if such a system were pursued?—I should think that, if the cost of transit and other charges would thereby be reduced, it would be a very considerable benefit to the community.

8310. And the agricultural interest would also be much benefited by there being less disease?—Clearly, if there be any truth in the statement that these diseases are introduced from abroad, of which I have very little doubt in my own mind.

8311. Then the encouragement of the importation of dead meat into this country would have a beneficial effect upon the agriculture of the Continent, inasmuch as it would compel the farmers there to improve their stock?—I do not quite know what you mean by "encouragement"; you do not mean encouragement by legislative measures?

8312. Perhaps I should have said that it would have the effect of developing the dead-meat trade?—Yes.

8313. It would induce the farmers on the Continent to improve their stock, so that they might compete with the American dead meat that is sent into this country?—They are already doing so. In the matter of pigs, some Members of the Committee know that I am rather celebrated for my herd of pigs. I have sent a very large number to the Continent lately for breeding purposes, because they have found it necessary, in order to meet the requirements of our own bacon market. The dealers in London will not buy the continental bacon, or they will not give so good a price. The same thing holds good of Ireland. I have also sent a large number to Ireland to improve their breeds for the same reason.

Mr. *M'Lagan*—continued.

8314. How would you treat the dairy cows that are now imported into this country?—I admit, of course, that there is some difficulty as to them; but I say that they would be enhanced in value by being placed in quarantine.

8315. It was stated by a previous witness that he would allow these cows to come into isolated dairies near the ports of debarkation; what would be your view of that?—That is such exceptional legislation that it does not commend itself to my mind.

Mr. *Jacob Bright.*

8316. You say that you would compel the slaughter of all fat cattle at the ports of entry?—Yes.

8317. And you think that we should get quite as much meat in that way as we do with the freedom that we have now?—I do. I see no reason why it should be diminished.

8318. I suppose that a foreign country would rather not be scheduled?—They are much afraid of being scheduled.

8319. Then it would look as if being scheduled diminishes the profits of their trade?—That is owing to the regulations on this side, and not from the principle of scheduling. We send their cattle to a very inconvenient and very expensive market; the Deptford Market I am speaking of particularly.

8320. I suppose that scheduled countries may send their cattle to various ports in the country?—Yes; but the bulk comes to London, and I know that they are afraid of the Deptford Market. I have had communications to that effect from the Commissioner of Agriculture in Hanover just lately.

8321. So far as we have had experience, to schedule a country is to compel it to resort to a mode of trade which diminishes the profits, is it not?—In my evidence in chief, I stated that I would send all cattle, from whatever country in Europe they came, to one market, except for the purpose of store stock. There would be no necessity then to schedule countries.

8322. You propose that all fat cattle should be slaughtered at the port of entry, do you not?—Yes; for instance, at the port of London, where they principally come to. The bulk of the foreign fat cattle comes to the London market.

8323. So far the necessity of slaughtering cattle at the port of entry has been to diminish the profit upon the cattle, has it not?—I do not know that of my own knowledge. I should imagine that that would be the case, not from the fact of the country being scheduled, but from the imperfect market which we have provided for the metropolis. I think that that has had far more to do with it than the fact of the country being scheduled.

8324. You are probably aware that in the interior of this country, say in Lancashire, Yorkshire, and in Staffordshire, those who represent the people at all on this question are afraid of its being made compulsory to slaughter animals at the

Mr. *Jacob Bright*—continued.

the port of entry?—I should imagine that it is a very natural fear, but I think it is a very groundless one.

8325. Still you must admit that it is a fear that exists?—You would know more about that than myself.

8326. If you slaughter your cattle at Hull, or any other port that supplies these large populations in the interior, is it not likely that there would be some difficulty in getting the meat to the homes of the people in as good a state as it would be if cattle were brought alive into the interior of the country?—I think that if cattle can be sent from Texas, and killed probably in New York or in some other part of America, and then sent over here, there ought to be no difficulty in getting dead meat from Hull.

8327. I am not speaking of what may be, or of what might be, or what it is at present; we have no plan at present in operation that would overcome certain difficulties, have we?—I do not know to what difficulties you particularly refer.

8328. In hot weather, if you slaughtered cattle in Hull for the supply of Manchester, Sheffield, or even York, do you not think that there would be some difficulty in the people getting the same kind of supplies as they do now?—There might be; and, therefore, I would not introduce changes quickly. I would give time before the effects of those changes were felt. I would leave that to natural causes; all that will come right.

8329. You admit that unless people were to adopt some different method from that which they have adopted, in fact, unless they were to make safeguards against the difficulties to which I have referred, there would probably be an outcry that the meat was not good, and so on?—I do not admit that, although I am not prepared to deny it; it might be so.

8330. You have got the county of Bedford in a very healthy state, you said?—Yes, and most other counties of England are so now.

8331. That is to say, you have got most of the counties of England in a very healthy state, although you have this comparatively free import of cattle from abroad?—Yes, but they are not allowed to come near our healthy cattle; that is the reason why we are free from disease. Those cattle come but they are slaughtered. There has been no movement of the cattle.

8332. From a certain number of countries there is free importation, is there not?—Yes, but movement is not permitted, and therefore there is no chance of conveying disease.

8333. You think that if those cattle could have free access to this country you would have disease again?—We have every reason to come to that conclusion reasoning from the past. We have nothing else to guide us.

8334. You said that the fear of disease did much to deter farmers from enterprise in their business, did you not?—No doubt it naturally deters men from embarking in the same business, and it also cripples their means.

8335. Have you not known farmers who, in spite of all this, if they had capital and anything like energy, could produce a vast amount of meat?—Some farms in England produce three times what others do.

8336. In spite of this fear of diseases?—Yes. Of course they are not the only reasons for a smaller supply of animal food being raised than could be raised.

8337. You think that, besides the fear of disease, there are other influential reasons which deter the farmers from producing a large amount of meat?—There are very grave reasons.

8338. What sort of reasons?—I may explain, briefly, that the production of meat is a slow process, and it is a means mainly to an end of raising a farm in condition. Every member will know, whether he is engaged in agriculture or not, what condition means. The more meat a farmer produces the higher he raises his farm in condition; and seeing that the great bulk of the country have not had, nor do they have now, security of capital, that has a very great influence in diminishing the supply of meat. Of course the want of security brings in another question which is a cognate one, namely, social position. If a man has not security he has not independence, and if he has not independence he has not social position; and the tendency of that is to drive men of spirit and men of capital out of farming. In my time I have known a vast amount of capital repelled from agriculture. Of course the game laws, to a certain extent, interfere with the production of meat.

8339. The fear of disease is one of several very influential causes of the absence of enterprise on the part of the farmers?—Yes.

Mr. *French.*

8340. With regard to the importation of cattle from Ireland, you say that you are in favour of stopping the importation altogether whenever disease exists there?—I said whenever contagious diseases exist there.

8341. By that you mean foot-and-mouth disease, I suppose?—Yes.

8342. Are you acquainted with the mode of farming in Ireland?—Yes.

8343. You have been over there?—Yes, many times.

8344. Do you know that a good deal of the raising of stock is carried on by small farmers, who put their cattle out to graze with neighbouring farmers when they are yearlings?—Yes, I do.

8345. And they leave them there for half a year or so?—Yes.

8346. Do you not think that the imposition of these restrictions would greatly interfere with the raising of those cattle?—No.

8347. How would you manage when the time for which they were put out to graze with a large farmer came to an end, in the case of foot-and-mouth disease breaking out, say, on a neighbouring farm?—I have said nothing with regard to regulating the internal conditions of farming in Ireland.

8348. I understood you to say that you would place Ireland under the same restrictions as you recommend for England?—Certainly. There are lots of small farmers in England who turn out their cattle in the same way. I am perfectly aware that there is a larger proportion of small farmers in Ireland, but there is no difference of principle.

8349. Then you would leave those cattle with the large farmers when the time was up in case disease broke out anywhere in the district?—I would not leave them with the large farmer?

Mr. *Howard.*

29 June 1877.

Mr. *French*—continued.

I should not interfere in any way by legislation.

8350. I understood you to say that you were not in favour of the restrictions which were re-recommended by Professor Brown?—I did not refer to Professor Brown; I gave my own notions as to what the restrictions should be. But if I understood your question it amounted to this: whether I would throw the trade into the hands of the large farmer, and prevent the small farmer from carrying on his business, I say I would not.

8351. What I wish to know is whether those restrictions would have such an effect as to prevent the large farmers taking in those cattle by forcing them to keep them after the time?—That is a matter of detail which I really could not enter into.

8352. You say that you would be in favour of putting the carrying out of these restrictions in the hands of the Privy Council of England, and taking it out of the hands of the Privy Council in Dublin?—I did not quite say that; I said that I would retain the power of prohibition in the hands of the Privy Council in Dublin. I would have the law and regulations for both countries uniform.

8353. But the regulations at present are in the hands of the Privy Council in Dublin?—In my opinion it is very immaterial in whose hands the power is so long as the country is freed from disease.

8354. The country is at present virtually free from disease, I believe?—I am glad to hear it.

8355. You have not heard that before?—No; I was not aware that it was free from disease; I have often heard it asserted before.

8356. Do you think that England is free from foot-and-mouth disease at present?—Tolerably free.

8357. Do you attribute that to the regulations imposed in consequence of the cattle plague?—Undoubtedly.

8358. Then how do you account for the fact, that Ireland is tolerably free where those regulations are not in force?—I do not know the circumstances, and until I know all the circumstances I could not form an opinion.

8359. It is a fact, I believe, and it has been acknowledged by other witnesses, that Ireland is at present very free from foot-and-mouth disease?—I do not know the facts or circumstances, and therefore I could not venture to express an opinion as to that.

8360. Did you hear it stated that most of the foot-and-mouth disease imported by Irish cattle was caused, not by the disease existing in the country itself, but by the disease being contracted on the journey?—I have heard that opinion expressed, but I do not for a moment believe in it, because it is contrary to the generally received opinion amongst scientific men of the present day that contagious diseases can only be communicated by germs.

8361. But, as I understand, the germs are in the boats?—Very likely. Then you must disinfect the boats.

8362. It is the fault of the local authorities here, as well as of those on the other side, that the boats are not kept in proper condition?—They are probably both in fault, but I do not know it.

Mr. *Anderson.*

8363. Do you think it impossible to keep contagious diseases out of a country altogether by stopping importation?—Impossible is a wide word, but I should try it; I think that it is desirable.

8364. How do you account for the fact of an outbreak of cattle disease occurring in the last century, when there was a complete absence of all importation, or where, at any rate, importation was quite illegal?—Of course there are many means of conveying cattle diseases, otherwise than by the animals themselves.

8365. Then you aim at something else besides merely keeping out animals?—I believe there was only one outbreak of cattle plague in the last century, and we were free for a hundred years.

8366. That outbreak was a very bad one, was it not?—Not worse than it would be at the present day, but for the regulations which exist and the superior knowledge which has been gained.

8367. And that outbreak took place, notwithstanding the fact that all importations were illegal?—But the blockade was very often run; it is well known that Dutch cattle were run in; they were smuggled. Looking to the fact that the running in of cattle was well known in the last century, it is possible that disease might have been communicated in that way.

8368. And that running in might continue if you prohibited importation now, might it not?—Clearly.

8369. Would not an absolute prohibition of importation have a tendency to cause the running in of cattle?—Of course all restrictions lead to smuggling, but at the present day I do not think there is any practical danger of that.

8370. Therefore the tendency of restrictions would be to cause cattle to be smuggled in?—I would point out that the restrictions proposed are not prohibitions.

8371. Then you do not propose to prohibit?—Clearly not; I am too much of a free-trader.

8372. You merely propose restrictions?—Certainly.

Mr. *Pease.*

8373. How long a quarantine would you institute?—I have stated already that I would have a quarantine of two months.

8374. During those two months, in whose care would the animals be?—In the hands of officials.

8375. And therefore the Government of the country would become responsible for everything that happened, whether they were underfed or overfed?—That would depend upon the terms of the contract or arrangement.

8376. Do you not think that there would be a difficulty in giving satisfaction if beasts were lodged with Government authorities for two months?—Yes; they would, however, know what risks they had to incur before they sent them, and I have no doubt that it might lead to difficulty and trouble. I said at the outset that the question of quarantine is surrounded with very grave difficulties, but I do not think that those difficulties are insuperable.

8377. Still you would apply that very difficult system of quarantine and slaughter at the port to all animals coming in, although they might have

come

Mr. *Pease*—continued.

come from a country which, so far as we could ascertain, was free from disease?—Yes; because it is very difficult, in spite of information, to detect an outbreak of disease in foreign countries. I have travelled extensively in Europe, and I have been told by Belgian, Dutch, German, and Austrian farmers, that they are subject to get these diseases by unprincipled dealers and others bringing animals from Poland and Russia; and, seeing that that difficulty exists, I think that those restrictions are wise.

8378. You think that no system of inspection at home and abroad would obviate the difficulty even in the case of such countries?—Experience shows that inspection is not to be relied upon. You will perceive the difficulty of the case at once. A number of boats laden with cattle and sheep arrive at a port; of course dispatch is imperative, and the inspection of those animals must necessarily be very brief, and very imperfect.

8379. Do you propose the same system of quarantine with regard to Irish cattle which come in for grazing purposes?—I stated that I had no doubt that the Irish people would take the readiest and the most vigorous means of stamping out contagious diseases if quarantine were imposed; and that there is no difficulty in stamping out disease, we have found by recent and former experience.

8380. And you think that it would be compatible with the interest of the English farmer, who, in many parts, very largely depends upon the Irish cattle, and with the interests of the Irish farmer, who raises them for grazing?—Yes, I think that it would be compatible with the interests of the whole community, and particularly with those of the Irish farmer, whose beasts are depreciated, say, from 1 *l.* to 2 *l.* a head, from the suspicion which lurks in the minds of buyers. Irish cattle are continually palmed off as English-bred cattle by dealers, who know that they are not worth so much money. My own bailiff bought a lot, and he told me that they were Lincolnshire cattle; I told him as soon as I saw them that they were Irish cattle, which they proved to be.

8381. Have you read, or did you hear, the evidence which was given by the gentleman who is the cattle inspector for the corporation of Liverpool?—I have not.

8382. He gave very strong evidence that the meat from the live cattle imported from America was of very superior quality to the American dead meat, and that it was worth 2 *d.* per pound more in the Liverpool market than the dead meat?—I cannot speak to that from my own knowledge; but having travelled through most of the States I should be of a different opinion.

8383. Is not that evidence very much opposed to your view of the importation of dead meat being preferable to the importation of live cattle?—I simply do not believe that the quality of meat is deteriorated by being kept cool for a certain time.

8384. Is not the quality of meat deteriorated by its being very much handled?—It depends upon what you mean by handling; it is not deteriorated by packing.

8385. If meat were taken out of the ship at Liverpool, put into railway trucks, taken out of the trucks again at Leeds, or Sheffield, passed through the streets to butchers' shops, and perhaps distributed from the wholesale butchers to the retail butchers; would it not be very much deteriorated by such a process as that?—It depends upon the extent to which that is carried. I do not think that simply taking it out of the hold of a vessel and sending it 200 miles by railway, and hanging it up in a butcher's shop, would cause much deterioration; at all events that is not found to be the case in my own borough, where they buy the American meat very freely, and it is spoken of very highly.

Mr. *Pease*—continued.

8386. Did you hear the evidence which was given before this Committee by a butcher from Leeds, who said that he had entirely given up buying beasts and slaughtering them at Hull, in order that he might buy Irish beasts and slaughter them at home?—That may be; but if the meat is of good quality when it is slaughtered in America it cannot be of bad quality when it is landed in England.

8387. That Leeds butcher also said that he had always taken cattle from Hull to Leeds to kill rather than slaughter them at Hull, because the meat produced a much better price?—I think economists now broadly divide society into classes, producers and dividers, and they contend that the convenience of the dividers is a very small part of economical arrangements, seeing that they do not enrich the country, and neither augment nor diminish the supply, they are not entitled to the same consideration as the producers.

Colonel *Kingscote*.

8388. You said that you had travelled in America a good deal; can you confirm what witnesses before this Committee have said, that the quantity of meat which they can supply us with from America is almost boundless?—Of course there is a limit to production in America as there is in other countries and also a limit as what can be spared for export. I have seen what I think are most exaggerated statements. There must have been a market for their surplus stock prior to the introduction of it into England. There is no question that the first effect of exporting American meat to England would be to raise the price across the Atlantic; but everyone who has been in America, and travelled over those vast prairies, knows that their powers of production are almost unlimited. Still, as I have already stated, the power of production of any country very much depends upon the number of mothers, which cannot be increased at pleasure.

8389. You told us that your own opinion, and that of most farmers, was that the very heavy loss which took place in this country was from foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia; do you think that it would be worth while to endeavour, by carrying out the same restrictions as are now imposed when the rinderpest is in the country, to stamp out those diseases; do you think that it would eventually be for the interest of both breeders and consumers?—I think that it would eventually be very much to the advantage of the community that we should be entirely free from contagious diseases; and I am quite a disciple of Dr. Budd Dr. Richardson, and others who have written on the subject of contagious diseases other than of animals, that when once you get rid of the germs of contagion, you dry up the source of contagion.

8390. Do you think it would be worth while for 12 months, or 18 months, or two years, to impose these restrictions with the view of getting rid

Mr. *Howard*.

29 June 1877.

Mr. *Howard.*

29 June 1877.

Colonel *Kingscote*—continued.

rid of these diseases?—I do not think that so long a time would be necessary. I think that if very vigorous measures were taken, the whole country might be free from disease in three months.

Mr. *Arthur Peel.*

8391. An honourable Member asked you just now about statements with regard to the number of cattle in America, and you said that you had seen exaggerated statements; would you call this an exaggerated statement which has been made before this Committee, that there are 10,000,000 cattle in Texas, which is 4,000,000 more than there are in the United Kingdom?—I have not been to Texas, but I have had a good deal of communication with landed proprietors and others in Texas. I grounded my observations upon this, that the surplus meat of America must have found a market before this market was opened, and therefore to say that they could send us an unlimited quantity was contrary to reason.

8392. You are the last person that one would suspect of leaning towards protection; you are a freetrader, and everybody knows it; and you do not want protection from competition?—No, and I never once heard a single farmer raise the question.

8393. All you want is protection from disease?—Yes, I have often talked the matter over, and farmers say as to this American importation of meat, "Well, there is no help for it; we must meet it;" there is no jealousy of it. I am quite sure that the impression that has been on the minds of some friends of my own who are freetraders, is entirely erroneous, that there is any desire upon the part of the agricultural community to obtain anything in the shape of protection.

8394. As to stamping out these diseases at home, dropping the question for the moment as to whether they are introduced or not, do you believe that you could stamp out foot-and-mouth disease?—Certainly; nothing would be easier.

8395. I ask you that question because we have had evidence to the contrary given us by very competent people, who have stated that it is impossible to stamp out foot-and-mouth disease?—We have what is better than opinion, facts; we have had two periods in which cattle plague regulations have been put in force in England, and in each case it has resulted in the entire stamping out of that particular disease.

8396. But that is by a machinery which was intended for the purpose of stamping out cattle plague?—But by the same machinery foot-and-mouth disease was stamped out. Your question was whether it could be stamped out.

8397. But do you think that it is a practical remedy?—Certainly.

8398. Do you think that the people would stand the machinery necessary to stamp out cattle plague for the purpose of repressing foot-and-mouth disease?—I may say that foot-and-mouth disease has entailed ten-fold the loss that rinderpest has ever done, and that farmers have very great fear of foot-and-mouth disease, especially breeders; and if those vigorous measures were put in force, and they had the assurance that the best means would be adopted for preventing the reintroduction of those diseases, I believe they would most cheerfully acquiesce. Of course it hinges upon that: whether you are going to take

Mr. *Arthur Peel*—continued.

subsequent stringent measures to prevent their reintroduction.

8399. But talking simply of the extinction of foot-and-mouth disease in this country, Professor Brown stated that the measures which are now taken, and which have been taken, were merely obstructive without being effectual?—Facts are before opinions.

8400. You do not agree with him?—Look at our own county—your county and mine; we are entirely free; we have not a single case of foot-and-mouth disease. What can be done in one county can be done in another, and that with the least inconvenience to the farming community. The dealers, as I say, and the other dividers, have had their trade and their profits interfered with by restrictions, and of course they cry out, but nobody else does; the farmers have not cried out.

8401. There again the restrictions in Bedfordfordshire were not directed against foot-and-mouth disease, but against other diseases?—Yes, of course. When rinderpest broke out in Middlesex, we thought it necessary to adopt the most stringent measures for keeping the disease out of the country, and succeeded.

8402. But would you adopt such a tremendous machinery for the extinction of a disease like foot-and-mouth disease, apart from the other two diseases?—Certainly; it is more important, though of course the other, rinderpest, is more virulent and more difficult of extinction.

8403. In stopping the importation of live cattle from abroad, of course you would do it with great precautions?—Yes, certainly.

8404. And you would not agree with Professor Gamgee, who would shut out live cattle tomorrow morning?—That would be the safer plan, as I have already stated; but of course you cannot adopt measures that are contrary to the views of the country, and therefore it is useless to talk about it.

8405. You made what seemed a very important remark, of which I should like to have some explanation, as I did not quite understand its import; you said that you would continue the scheduling of countries as long as foreign cattle mixed with home cattle?—Certainly; that applies to store stock.

8406. Does that apply to markets at the port of debarkation?—No; I would continue the scheduling of countries so long as any arrivals introduced from abroad were allowed to mix with our own cattle; but if you establish a separate market for the slaughter of animals from abroad, then, I say, there is no reason for continuing the system of scheduling countries.

8407. But I thought that you were in favour of killing all fat cattle at the port of arrival?—Yes.

8408. Therefore, how could they mix with the home cattle?—I said that so long as foreign cattle were allowed to mix with English cattle I would continue scheduling; but when they are all killed at one market, then I see no necessity for keeping it up.

8409. What I mean by scheduling is, admitting cattle, but causing them to be slaughtered at the port of arrival?—Clearly; a scheduled country is a suspected country.

8410. You went on to say that the whole question hinges upon the question of separate or united markets; I do not understand how you could

Mr. *Arthur Peel*—continued.

could have a united market if you killed all the animals at the port?—I said a separate market, and one market for all foreign cattle; and I gave my reasons, it will be remembered, for advocating that course. It would have the advantage of simplicity to begin with, and foreigners would not be left in doubt.

8411. You spoke of the time when you were a boy in 1830 or 1840, and you said that you never knew a case of foot-and-mouth disease?—I never heard of such a thing.

8412. Did you ever know a case of pleuro-pneumonia?—We used to have the old-fashioned lung disease which we have now, but that was not a contagious disease.

8413. And that lung disease never showed the symptoms which now attend pleuro-pneumonia?—No, lung disease is an entirely separate disease. That has been known for generations. I stated that old writers upon veterinary science never once alluded to either foot-and-mouth disease or pleuro-pneumonia; they give descriptions of lung disease and of foot soreness.

Major *Allen*.

8414. You say that when we had the rinderpest regulations in force, foot-and-mouth disease practically disappeared?—Yes.

8415. That is to say, in consequence of the rinderpest regulations, there was no movement of animals?—Quite so.

8416. And hence the disappearance of the disease?—Yes.

8417. And from that, you think that if we were to put these regulations in force for three months we might reasonably hope to have mastered the evil?—I think, judging by the results of similar measures in the past, you have a right to come to that conclusion.

8418. What measures would you adopt with regard to the importation of sheep dead or alive?—I should adopt the same regulations with regard to sheep as with regard to cattle, because they can convey disease as well as cattle.

8419. We hear that there is a great trade in dead carcases of sheep from the Deptford Market to Merthyr Tydfil, which would show that all towns can be supplied with dead meat?—Yes; no doubt trade can adapt itself to circumstances. The commercial element is tolerably well developed in England, and traders know they must adapt their trade to circumstances.

8420. You think that we should do something now to let the country know that they must for their own sakes be prepared to deal with the

Major *Allen*—continued.

dead meat?—I have said that I would not introduce changes hastily; because if you are going to make changes, it is better to give people plenty of time to adapt themselves to changes of circumstances, or you might derange a very important branch of business.

8421. You say that you would schedule Ireland, but that, on the other hand, you would treat Ireland as an integral part of England; supposing that they had the cattle plague in the county of Cork alone, would you stop the importation of all animals from all other counties in Ireland?—Certainly; and I do not see that the country would be safe if such were not the case; I prefer the streak of sea between us to the rail of iron over there. You would in these circumstances soon stamp it out.

8422. Supposing, as I suggest that there was foot-and-mouth disease in the county of Cork alone, you would schedule Ireland at once?—Yes, for this reason; the system adopted in England of buying Irish store stock has been a very great and incalculable advantage to Ireland; and I think that, as English farmers, we may ask from Ireland some sacrifice in return. An honourable Member laughs, but I do not ground my suggestion upon that alone; I say that in the interest of Ireland itself it is necessary that these diseases should be stamped out.

Chairman.

8423. I suppose you are aware that Ireland in the recent outbreak absolutely prohibited the import of all animals from this island?—Yes.

8424. All you represent is that, supposing that the restrictions and regulations which you suggest should be adopted, if an outbreak occurred in Ireland, this power should remain with us of prohibiting the import from Ireland, as you would leave the power with them of prohibiting the cattle going from us to that country?—Clearly. As I have already stated, I am in favour of equal laws between the two countries; and so long as they have the power to prohibit our cattle, I do not see that they can find fault with us for prohibiting theirs.

8425. And you would advocate uniformity of regulations on the ground that, by that uniformity, probably Ireland would be brought into the same healthy condition as you expect here?—Yes; and I would point out that it would be attended with the most serious inconveniences to the English farmer were the Irish store stock to have to go into quarantine: the interests of the Irish farmers and the English are so far mutual.

Mr. *Howard*.

29 June 1877.

Mr. Adam Smith, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

8426. You represent here the Highland Agricultural Association, I believe?—I do.

8427. In that capacity you can speak of the views of that association with regard to the question which has been submitted to the consideration of this Committee?—I can.

8428. Has your Association recently passed any resolutions with regard to this subject?—They have.

8429. Will you tell the Committee what the substance of those resolutions was?—With the permission of the Committee, I will read the me-

Chairman—continued.

morial to the Privy Council which was agreed to on the 14th of February.

8430. In consequence of the outbreak of cattle plague?—Yes. The more important paragraphs of the memorial are as follows: "That your memorialists consider that the difficulty of importing dead meat has been solved by the success which has obtained in bringing in such large quantities from America. That your memorialists believe this imported meat to be more wholesome for food than the meat of fat animals imported alive and killed on arrival, they being heated and fevered in transit.

Mr. *Smith*.

Mr. *Smith.*

29 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

transit. That your memorialists are of opinion that so long as the importation of live stock is allowed except for breeding purposes by special license, the country will never be free from such diseases as pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease, with the risk, as on the present occasion, of rinderpest being introduced. That your memorialists therefore humbly crave your Lordships to take into your serious consideration, now that it has been proved that dead meat can be imported from such distant countries, whether the importation of live stock, except as above stated, should not be entirely prohibited. That, should it be considered impracticable to prohibit entirely the importation of live stock, except as above stated, your memorialists are of opinion that a strict quarantine of sufficient duration, under Government superintendence, should be established at the ports of debarkation. Your memorialists would humbly impress on your Lordships the enormous losses of late years amongst home stocks from disease, which they believe would be very greatly lessened, if not entirely suppressed, were their views adopted."

8431. Those resolutions were passed by the association at the time of the last outbreak of cattle plague, and forwarded to the Privy Council?—They were.

8432. Had you at that time considered the question of the new trade which had sprung up in America in the importation of dead meat?—Yes, that was considered.

8433. Have there been large importations into Scotland?—Yes, there have been pretty considerable importations.

8434. Are you prepared to say that a dead-meat trade would be advantageous as compared with the present trade in live animals?—I think it would.

8435. You would prohibit the importation of live stock from foreign countries on the ground that the dead-meat trade having been shown to be possible, that is a safer way of introducing the meat from those countries?—Quite so.

8436. Would you include in that prohibition the introduction of store animals?—Yes, I would; I do not think there would be any security from disease if store animals were admitted.

8437. You think that the allowing of store animals to come in would really leave the door open still for the introduction of disease?—Quite so.

8438. Do you think that the introduction of store animals is wanted, or that there is a demand for store animals from foreign countries?—I think they could be done without; I think that, the diseases being lessened, more cattle would be bred in Great Britain, and it would be an advantage both to the consumer and to the producer, for the cattle to be perfectly free from disease.

8439. Are you dependent at all now in your part of Scotland upon the store animals which are imported from abroad?—No, I should say not.

8440. You do not import from Denmark, for instance?—There is some import, but I do not think that the country is quite dependent upon them.

8441. The gap left by prohibiting the introduction of store animals would, in your opinion, be very soon filled by increased production at home?—I think it would.

Chairman—continued.

8442. Are you able to say whether there has been any great decrease of stock recently in the Lothians?—There has been. In the three Lothians, from 1873 to 1876, the total decrease of sheep has been upwards of 10,000.

8443. On what original total number did that decrease occur?—On something like 406,000.

8444. In what period of time did that decrease take place?—During the four years betwixt 1873 and 1876.

8445. Has that diminution of stock arisen from losses from diseases?—I think it has, partly, at any rate.

8446. From foot-and-mouth disease?—Yes.

8447. When you say that there has been a diminution of the stock, is that of the total stock, or did you refer only to sheep?—That is of the total stock of sheep of the three Lothians.

8448. Has there been any diminution of the number of cattle in those parts?—Yes; of some 1,430 on a total of about 37,000.

8449. And that loss of cattle you would put down also to losses from either foot-and-mouth disease or pleuro-pneumonia?—Very much to those diseases.

8450. Have you had any recent outbreak of either pleuro-pneumonia or foot-and-mouth disease in your district?—During the last year there has been a considerable outbreak in East Lothian. I have the statistics for that. I could not get them from the other counties. Betwixt 1875 and 1876 there were 5,000 cattle and 140,000 sheep affected, in East Lothian alone, mostly with foot-and-mouth disease.

8451. Out of the totals which you have given us?—Yes.

8452. I suppose you would represent that that shows a great loss to the consumer, inasmuch as the animals are, of course, kept back by the disease from being brought upon the market and are taking the place of other stock that might have been brought forward?—Quite so.

8453. Have the absolute death losses from foot-and-mouth disease been severe?—Not solely death losses.

8454. You speak of the deterioration of the stock, and having to feed that stock twice?—Quite so; I have often in my practical experience heard that cattle were affected with foot-and-mouth disease; it was equivalent to a loss of 3 *l.* per head on the animals affected.

8455. Do you take that diminution of value generally as an average over all your stock, including the dairy stock and fat animals, or does it apply only to the fat animals?—Over the whole of the animals.

8456. I suppose that the breeding stock are affected more seriously by it from the fact of the disease often producing abortion?—Yes; it is worse in breeding stock than in ordinary feeding stock.

8457. And those diseases, which you describe as having been prevalent lately, you attribute in a great measure to the foreign import?—Yes.

8458. You believe that, with proper regulations, you could stamp out those diseases in this country?—I believe that they could be quite stamped out. I do not believe that they belong to this country naturally.

8459. Do you think that, with the view of stamping out these diseases, the farmers in the Lothians would be prepared to submit to such additional restrictions and regulations as have been

Chairman—continued.

been described by other witnesses to this Committee?—I think that, in the prohibition of live stock from abroad, they would be quite agreeable. I am also a member of the Farmers' Club, in East Lothian, and they passed a resolution lately, wishing to encourage the importation of dead meat, and to prohibit the importation of live stock, and they would be quite agreeable to any restrictions so as to prevent disease.

8460. They would submit to any restriction which had for its object the stamping out of the disease, if they were secured against what they believe to be the source of its reintroduction into this country?—Quite so.

8461. Do you represent, then, to the Committee that, in the interest not only of the farmer but of the consumer this would be a gain to the community?—I think it would be for the benefit of the consumer as well as of the producer.

8462. By increasing the home stock and giving such security to farmers as would encourage them in increasing the breeding power of the country, and thus placing a larger supply ultimately upon the market?—Quite so.

8463. Do you believe that the foreign trade which you suggest should be restricted in this way would come to us through the channel of a dead-meat trade?—I think it would. I think that the American dead-meat trade is only in its infancy.

8464. But with regard to the foreign supply which you say you would prevent coming here alive, do you believe that if you prevented the live animals coming from the Continent, say from Denmark, they would come as dead meat?—I think they would.

8465. Or would you have them over here to be slaughtered at the port of debarkation?—I think it would be better and more secure to have them as dead meat.

8466. I think I understood you to say that you have a good trade in animals with Denmark at present?—Yes.

8467. They come to Leith, I believe?—Yes.

8468. Do you believe that it would be necessary to prohibit their import, looking to the fact that Denmark has been represented as being, and I suppose you will admit that it is, a country where there is very little disease among their herds?—I think we should not be safe as long as we imported any foreign animals.

8469. I understand it to be your general view that they should be absolutely prohibited from the Continent on the ground of your not being able to get sufficient security, as you believe, against the introduction of disease from those parts?—Quite so.

8470. And you think that that would be made up to the consumer in this country by an increased home production?—I do.

8471. Supplemented by the dead-meat trade which you foresee from America?—Yes.

8472. You have spoken of the regulations which you think that the farmers would submit to; would you let those regulations remain as they are at present, under the jurisdiction of the local authority, or would you make them uniform, emanating from a central authority?—I would agree with their being made uniform from the central authority or the Privy Council. I think that there is a great deal of disease in our country at present from the restrictions not being uniform, and not being strictly enforced by the local authorities.

Chairman—continued.

8473. You represent to the Committee that there is great disadvantage in the localities having the power of making those regulations, from the fact that there is a want of uniformity between them; because where you have strict regulations in one county you may have very lax ones in the next?—Yes.

8474. Do you think that the farmer would be prepared to submit to regulations made by a central authority such as the Privy Council?—Certainly.

8475. How would you deal with the question of inspection for the carrying out of such regulations; should there be officers appointed by the central authority to see that the regulations were enforced, or would you leave the appointment of the inspectors, as was suggested by the last witness, to the locality?—No; I think that the officers should be appointed by a central board.

8476. You think that, the central authority having to make the regulations, they should appoint their own officers to carry them out?—Quite so.

8477. From what fund do you suggest that the cost of this inspection should be defrayed?—The country should pay, I think, for what they are reaping a benefit from.

8478. You would make it an Imperial charge?—Yes, I would make it an Imperial tax.

8479. On the ground that the country would benefit by the increased security to be given, and the consequent increased supply of food produced?—Quite so.

8480. Would you make the restrictions which you have described against the foreign import, apply equally to sheep and to cattle?—I am not so sure as to sheep. I think that it will be safer, but there is certainly not the same risk with sheep as with cattle.

8481. There being a much smaller risk, you think it might be possible to import sheep?—It might be if you could make sure that they were imported from a country where there was no disease, and that they had not been in contact with diseased cattle.

8482. Under proper regulations, would you be prepared to admit foreign sheep?—Yes.

8483. Would you admit them to be circulated freely throughout the country, or would you have them slaughtered at the port?—I think that it would be better to slaughter them at the port.

8484. Still, supposing that they came from a country as to which we had a fairly clean bill of health, you think that they might be sent through the country?—Yes; if they are not brought over in contact with animals from diseased countries.

8485. Are they dependent at all in Scotland upon the import of foreign sheep?—They are not wholly dependent upon it; there is a large number of sheep bred in Scotland, but there is a very large import also from abroad.

8486. And those at present have circulated freely without being slaughtered?—Yes.

8487. Are they imported for feeding purposes?—No, they are imported mostly for slaughtering.

8488. I understand you, then, to say that, whilst you think the import of foreign cattle should be prohibited, that relaxation might be made with a view of meeting the demands of many of our large towns for small foreign sheep?—Yes,

Mr. *Smith.*

29 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

—Yes, to a certain extent under proper regulations.

8489. Is there any other point which you wish to mention to the Committee in your examination in chief?—I think not.

Mr. *Arthur Peel.*

8490. Why would you slaughter all foreign cattle at the port?—For the prevention of what I think is imported disease.

8491. Would you slaughter them at the port of debarkation?—At the port of embarkation.

8492. You would not even allow them to come to this country, provided they were slaughtered at the port of arrival?—I would not.

8493. Why?—Because I think it would be the means of importing disease; it is very well known that people who go among these stock and handle them carry disease.

8494. But you would admit sheep to be slaughtered at the port of arrival?—Only under certain regulations. I would not admit sheep to be imported from a port of embarkation where foreign cattle were being slaughtered; I think that there would be risk there.

8495. But if you would admit sheep under regulations, to be slaughtered at the port of arrival, why is it not possible to have regulations which would make it perfectly safe to admit cattle, provided they were slaughtered at the port of arrival?—I think there is far more risk with cattle than with sheep.

Colonel *Kingscote.*

8496. Are you a practical farmer yourself?—I am.

8497. To a large extent?—I have farmed about 1,000 acres for the last 19 years.

Mr. *Pease.*

8498. Is it all the same farm?—In three farms.

8499. Have you held the same land for 19 years?—Yes.

8500. Can you tell us how many cattle you are carrying now?—My general rule has been to feed about 100 cattle a-year.

8501. Has your quantity materially decreased during the last five years?—I keep a flying stock, I do not breed.

8502. But you are keeping as many now as you did?—About as many.

8503. You have not been at all afraid of keeping cattle on account of the disease?—Yes, I have; I gave up breeding for that very reason. When I first began farming I bred a few.

8504. Not many, I suppose, in the Lothians?—No, but I bred, perhaps, a score or so.

8505. You are very much dependent upon the turnip crop in the Lothians?—Yes.

8506. What sort of a turnip crop had you in 1872?—The turnip crop was not so bad in 1872, though it was a bad year for other things.

8507. In 1873, 1874, and 1875, it was not an average crop, was it?—My mind does not carry me back so far as to enable me to say that it would be an average; I think it would be a very fair crop.

8508. Does not the state of the turnip crop very much influence the number of cattle carried upon the Lothians?—To a certain extent it does, but not so much, because other stuff can be got now; I think that the straw regulates the number of cattle in the Lothians more than the turnips.

Mr. *Pease*—continued.

8509. Have you had a fair amount of straw for the last two years?—Not particularly.

8510. You have not had an average harvest the last few years?—Fair.

8511. You do not think that that has influenced the decrease of stock?—I do not.

Mr. *King Harman.*

8512. How do you propose to deal with Irish store cattle?—I would put the Irish cattle under the same conditions as the cattle in England and Scotland.

8513. That is to say with regard to restrictions on bringing Irish stores into Scotland?—I would not count Irish stock as foreign stock, but I would count them as British stock. I would put them under the same regulations as England and Scotland, whatever those regulations were.

8514. Supposing that it was known that there was considerable foot-and-mouth disease in the South of Ireland, you would not prohibit the movement of stores from the North of Ireland to the port of Glasgow, for instance, would you?—No, certainly not.

Mr. *Jacob Bright.*

8515. Has the price of hay anything to do with the number of cattle kept?—Not much in the Lothians.

8516. It might have in England, might it not?—Yes; I think that there are more cattle fed on hay in England than there are in Scotland.

8517. Has not hay been exceptionally dear during the past few years?—It has.

8518. May not that have lessened the number of cattle kept?—It may have in England, but I do not think it has in Scotland. As I have already stated, we do not feed so much on hay.

8519. But you think that it may have had that effect in England?—It may have.

Mr. *M'Lagan.*

8520. You say that you have given up breeding now?—Yes.

8521. Did you give up breeding from your fear of your cattle being carried away by disease, or did you actually suffer from pleuro-pneumonia or foot-and-mouth disease in your dairy stock?—Yes, I have suffered several times both from pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease.

8522. And it is a fact, that cows are more apt to be attacked with those diseases than feeding cattle?—I do not know whether they are more apt to be attacked, but it is a far greater loss when they are attacked; it is almost sure to cause abortion, for instance, if it breaks out in a byre or cow-stable.

8523 Do you know whether the dairy farmers in Scotland have been obliged to alter their system on account of these diseases?—I believe they have, but I could not give you the particulars.

8524. Formerly, the dairy farmers in Scotland used to breed all the stock which they required to replenish their dairies; do they continue to do that, or do they now buy their cows, and take no calves whatever from these cows, but feed off the cows entirely?—Yes, a great many do.

8525. Do you think that the dread of the disease

Mr. *M'Lagan*—continued.

ease has anything to do with that?—There is not a doubt of it.

8526. So that if they should be attacked by the disease they have their cows half fat to bring to market at once?—Quite so.

8527. And that you suppose to be one of the causes of the reduction in the number of cattle bred in Scotland?—Certainly.

Mr. *Assheton.*

8528. I understood you to say that the number of sheep in a certain district had decreased by 10,000, and that the number of cattle had also decreased considerably; what have the farmers in that district done with the keep which they would have otherwise employed in feeding those beasts?—The people just grow anything else which might be sold. If there is a decrease in sheep, or a decrease in stock, of course there is less keep provided. The cropping goes into other crops, such as grain.

8529. I wanted to know whether more land is put under the plough?—I could not tell you from the statistics; I have not looked up that, but of course it would naturally arise that it would go elsewhere. Perhaps more hay would be sold, for instance, if there were fewer sheep kept.

8530. If there had been those 10,000 sheep, they would have eaten something or other; is it that grass has been produced and not eaten, or has the land been made to produce something else besides grass?—I think that the land will have been made to produce something else besides grass. I do not think there is much produced that is not eaten in Scotland.

8531. What would that someting else be?—It may extend over all the other crops. Without looking up the statistics I cannot tell you that.

8532. It is not that grass has been wasted, but that other crops have been produced; what is that other produce?—It would extend over all the other crops of the farm; hay and beans, for instance, and any other crops that are grown. I am speaking from practical experience; I am not giving it from any figures.

Mr. *Assheton*—continued.

Mr. *Smith.*

29 June 1877.

8533. I want to ascertain whether more land has been ploughed, than would have been ploughed if those 10,000 sheep had been alive?—Without looking up the statistics I could not tell you that. It is spread over the three counties. I could not tell you exactly the acres.

8534. I do not want the acreage, but those 10,000 sheep would have eaten something if they had been alive, and I wanted to know generally whether what has been produced instead, has been produced off meadow land or off ploughed land?—I am sorry to say that I cannot tell you.

Chairman.

8535. I suppose you are aware that the import of foreign animals into Scotland bears a very small proportion to the total amount of import into the United Kingdom?—I am.

8536. But in Scotland you are not so dependent upon the foreign stock as they are in other parts of the United Kingdom?—No, it has been estimated that only about six or seven per cent. are imported into Scotland.

Mr. *M'Lagan.*

8537. I think that at the present time other stuffs are consumed by cattle as well as turnips; I suppose you meant cake, and so on?—Yes.

8538. And if cattle are paying well you generally replenish your stalls with a good many more cattle, and you buy more of those extraneous stuffs to help your turnip crops?—Certainly.

8539. So that you may have fewer cattle, you may still not have more land under the plough, but will use less of these auxiliary feeding stuffs?—Yes, that does take place too.

8540. And it very often takes place when you have a dread of any disease coming on, you put on fewer cattle, and consume more food grown upon your own farm, and buy less extraneous food?—Yes.

8541. And that may account for your having the same breadth of turnips or grass, and the same breadth of cereal crops, and yet fewer cattle?—Quite so.

Mr. Anthony George Robinson, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

Mr. *Robinson.*

8542. I believe you are a Steam Ship Agent?—I am.

8543. And you have been connected with that trade from some considerable time?—I have.

8544. You have been for many years a large importer of cattle from the Continent, have you not?—I have.

8545. Have those importations been from the Continent generally, or have they been confined to some particular countries?—Mainly from Spain and Portugal, and some from Holland.

8546. But you are acquainted, I think, with the whole foreign cattle trade?—Entirely so.

8547. And you have a trade also with other countries?—Yes.

8548. Can you state to the Committee at what times of the year those importations principally come into this country?—I can. Norway has a spring trade from January or February, until March or April or May, perhaps. The trade from Sweden is from January to July. From

Chairman—continued.

Denmark the trade is all the year, but principally during the first six months of the year?—Then you come to Germany, we have the trade from Schleswig-Holstein from July until November; the German cattle from Prussia proper are mainly stall-fed cattle, and they come in the spring from January to July; the South German cattle and the Austrian cattle, when they are permitted to come the same. Oldenburg produces grass-fed cattle, and those come in the autumn. Then you come to Holland, and Holland produces all the year round. Belgium is mainly a country of transit from Germany.

8549. There is not much import from Belgium proper is there?—There is not much import from Belgium proper, with the exception of a few sheep. Then you come to France, which sends us stall-fed cattle more or less all the year round, and in the summer and autumn grass-fed cattle from Normandy; it was formerly a large supply until the war; but the war denuded the country

Mr. *Robinson.*

29 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

of cattle to such an extent that they have not got their supply of cattle up yet; and it is only in very small numbers that they come here.

8550. You attribute the diminution of the supply from that country to the fact of the supply in France in itself having been so much diminished by the war as to render it impossible that they should send food out of the country?—Yes; previously to the war in 1866, we imported 38,000 cattle from France, and in 1869 it was reduced to 21,000. The war came on in 1870, and in 1876 it was a little over 5,000; but it was reduced from 1866 to 1869 before the war from 38,000 to 21,000. Then you come to Spain, and we get from the North of Spain cattle all the year round, but none from any other part of Spain. From Portugal we get cattle all the year round.

8551. Then you have an import from France, Spain, and Portugal, and Germany all the year round?—Yes.

8552. Whilst you have your Schleswig-Holstein, Swedish, Danish, and Norwegian cattle coming at different times into the market, filling up the year between them?—Yes, the Danish cattle come all the year round, but the Swedish and Norwegian cattle come only in the spring.

8553. And Schleswig cattle come only in the autumn?—Yes.

8554. Are those cattle carried in ships kept separate for the trade, or are they brought over with other cargoes from those countries?—Schleswig-Holstein have nothing else to give us, and consequently they are brought separately, but the Swedish and Norwegian cattle are sent with general cargoes. A great many of the Danish cattle are sent in vessels exclusively devoted to the carriage of cattle. Some of the Danish supply are sent in vessels together with general cargo. The other German supply and the Dutch supply, and the French supply, with a trifling exception, and the entire of the Portuguese supply come in cargo vessels. The Spanish cattle generally come by themselves, partly by ships direct, principally by small sailing vessels to the out-ports, and what come here come in cargo vessels.

8555. In your opinion, which is the best method of dealing with the cattle trade; do they come over in better condition when they come over in separate boats than when they come with mixed cargoes?—No, I do not think that there is any difference.

8556. The same conditions for the proper carriage of the animal can be carried in both cases?—Quite so; they come rather better perhaps in the cargo boats than in those which are devoted to cattle exclusively.

8557. When the boat is exclusively used for the trade are not the conditions better than when the animals form part of the general cargoes?—No; all cattle vessels are now, under the Order of the Privy Council, obliged to be fitted in a particular way. Whether they are cargo vessels or cattle vessels they are not allowed to carry the cattle loose, or how we like, as we were allowed to in olden times.

8558. In this trade great improvement has taken place in the carriage of cattle by sea?—Yes, the vessels have improved and the mode of carrying the cattle has improved.

8559. With regard to the foreign import as at present regulated, we are dependent very much

Chairman—continued.

on inspection for protection against these diseases, which are under the consideration of the Committee, do you believe that the inspection which we have is sufficient for our protection against the importation of these diseases?—From my experience of it it is perfectly worthless. I have had cattle myself of my own import over and over again passed by the inspector and in the course of two or three days they have taken the foot-and-mouth disease (of which I am now speaking more particularly) to such an extent that we could not show them in the market, and we were obliged to sell them out of the market. Those animals had been inspected before being shipped, they had been inspected on landing, and had undergone the usual 12 hours' quarantine, or a longer time perhaps, and then they had been passed by the veterinery surgeon as sound. That has happened constantly; it is not one instance, but several instances. I have myself seen foreign cattle standing in the Metropolitan Market with incipient foot-and-mouth complaint. A neighbour of mine in Essex who had a dairy for his amusement (he is a city man), sent a special order to a salesman, a friend of his, for 20 Dutch cows for the purpose of bringing them in to calve down at a certain time; he had a herd of about 60 English cows. Those cattle were landed at Thames Haven, inspected by the inspector, put into railway trucks, taken round to Romford, and then taken direct from the railway station at Romford to his place. In the course of four or five days they began to fall, with foot-and-mouth complaint. Then it got to his own herd, and what between the loss of the milk and the loss of the cows from slipping their calves, he set down his loss at 600 *l.* at least, and gave up dairy-farming; he said he had had enough of it. He said, and I quite agree with him, that there was not in the neighbourhood or anywhere about any foot-and-mouth disease, until those cattle came.

8560. That you represent as another instance of the uselessness of relying on the inspection which at present exists?—Yes, and it is the same with regard to Irish cattle. A great deal more care is taken with regard to them than is taken with regard to the English cattle. The ships are disinfected under the orders of the Privy Council, and I have a letter from one company stating that they spend 5 *l.* or 6 *l.*, and even up to 8 *l.* a trip when they have a full cargo, in disinfecting the vessel; so that really on one vessel in a year, I expect, there is more money spent in disinfecting than there is in disinfecting the whole of London in a year. The cattle are inspected in Ireland by officers of the Privy Council before shipment at the port of embarkation, and marked by the inspector, the same as our officers here do if they inspect foreign cattle. Yet I heard Lord Fitzhardinge and his bailiff say here that he saw them landing cattle out of a vessel with foot-and-mouth complaint. As far as I have seen, I do not think that you could have a more efficient inspection there. We have all our cattle inspected abroad before shipment. The Government in Holland are under a pledge to our Government here to have the cattle inspected. I believe that the Privy Council or the Foreign Office arranged with the Dutch Government that, provided they inspect cattle, and ceased to be a transit country for cattle, and gave them notice if any disease

Chairman—continued.

disease broke out, they would not schedule Holland. That was the law before the breaking out of cattle plague. The consequence was that we were not allowed to embark cattle in Holland except by daylight, and they were immediately, previously to the shipment, inspected. In addition to that, we paid some inspectors ourselves, and I have known two inspectors pass a cargo of sheep, every sheep being put on a table and examined before they were put on board the vessel, and landed here the next day; and yet that cargo has been stopped by the Privy Council inspector on its arrival here, from its having palpable foot-and-mouth disease. Further, with regard to inspection, it is not the same in all ports. They are stricter in London than they are in the outports. I have had repeatedly to complain to the Privy Council of the course pursued in Harwich as compared with that pursued in London.

8561. You mean that it is so much less strict at Harwich?—Yes, the inspector at Harwich has passed cargoes of cattle, one in particular, before the expiration of the 12 hours, contrary to the regulations.

8562. In fact, you represent that not only is the inspection not sufficient to protect us, but that, under the present regulations, it is very unequal?—It is very unequal and irregular; and, further, it is a curious fact that in 1875 there was a great deal of foot-and-mouth disease in Holland, particularly (I am speaking of foot-and-mouth disease; with reference to cattle plague, we all know the extent of that, and where it comes from, and all about it); cargo after cargo arrived from Rotterdam in London, at Brown's Wharf, and at Thames Haven, and they were stopped one after another; the vessels left the port of Rotterdam for Harwich on the same afternoon as the vessels left there for London, bringing sheep more particularly, and sheep from the same markets, and from, I may say, the same men, and I believe out of the same fields; ship after ship arrived, and passed free at Harwich, and came up to the London market. I thought that so odd that I made some inquiries. I could not trace it, but all that I could find out was, that there was a difference between the mode of inspection at Harwich and the mode in London. The Government have been excessively particular, I think, in the men that they have selected. I never heard the slightest whisper of anything being wrong with them.

8563. Those were both Government inspectors?—They were both Government inspectors. I could not trace it, but I could only account for the thing in this way: that if they found a suspicious animal on board they stopped it, and slaughtered it, and passed the rest.

8564. You think that the regulation which applies in London, that if an animal is suspected of disease the whole of the cargo is sent for slaughter, does not apply at Harwich?—I cannot speak from my own knowledge, but I can only account for it in that way, because for two or three weeks cargo after cargo arrived at Harwich every day, five days a week, and they passed free; and then when I called the attention of the Privy Council to it in the month of August, a week or two afterwards, they began stopping them at Harwich, and they stopped them there as well as they did in London.

8565. What you represent to the Committee is, that sheep coming from what you describe as the same fields and from the same port, and sent by the same men going to two different ports, the cargoes in the one case were always stopped, and in the other case they were always allowed to go free in the market?—Yes.

8566. And you use that as an argument to show the uncertainty of results of inspection?—Yes, that is from my own knowledge as to the import of cattle.

8567. That being the case, have you considered whether you would adopt any more stringent measures, such as slaughtering at the port of embarkation?—Slaughtering at the port of embarkation, I think, would be too stringent a measure, because it would alter the trade completely; not that it could not be done, because we did it in 1866; we slaughtered them in Holland.

8568. During 1866, when the trade was prohibited, was there any large number of cattle slaughtered abroad and sent here as dead meat?—A considerable number.

8569. Are you able to speak to that of your own knowledge?—Yes; we brought as many as 3,100 or 3,200 sheep over in one ship.

8570. Was that a trade which continued for some time?—It continued throughout the year when they were obliged to be slaughtered; it commenced at the end of July, and then it went on to the end of the year.

8571. Can you give any instances of the amount that you brought over in the months of July and August, that year when the trade first began?—It was very small; in September the cargoes were 300, 560, 900, 1,070, 720, 220, 1,160, 1,040, 1,480, and 1,458.

8572. Those were slaughtered in Holland and brought as dead meat into this country?—Yes.

8573. And that occurred, as you state, at the time when our regulations, on account of the outbreak of 1865-66, had prohibited the import of live animals?—Yes.

8574. Showing, therefore, that when the prohibition took place a dead-meat trade arose at once?—Yes, it did. This is only from one part of Holland; I have not got the particulars of what came from the port of Rotterdam; this is only from North Holland. From Friesland, as they had no cattle plague there, we were allowed to bring them alive. We brought from Amsterdam, Nienw Diep, and Medenblik 45,000 sheep in 1865, and 1,900 beasts alive, mainly in the autumn. The next year when we had to slaughter them and bring them over dead, we only brought 132 beast and 39,673 sheep. Then in 1867, in January, they were still obliged to be slaughtered, we brought over 111 beasts and 844 sheep. Then the restriction was removed, and we brought 74,849 live sheep in 1867, against 39,673 dead the previous year.

8575. The trade immediately sprung up again on the restrictions being removed?—Yes; the continental cattle trade is very much in the hands of small dealers and farmers, men of very small capital, from Holland northwards; therefore if they had to slaughter them abroad, a new set of traders would have to spring up who would have to buy them, and take them to the large towns or cities, and slaughter them the same as they are doing in America, and send them over in that way.

Mr. *Robinson.*

29 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

8576. Though the slaughter of the animals in the country was possible, as is shown by what took place in Holland, still the diminution in the supply was so considerable that you do not believe that it would be possible to establish slaughter at the port of embarkation?—No; there is now a limited import of dead meat from abroad, more particularly from Holland and Hamburg; but I have taken out the quantity from Friesland, from where the principle import is, and I see that we carried in 1874, 8,191 cwt., principally mutton; in 1875 we carried 9,951 cwt., and in 1876 only 6,873 cwt.; so that it does not increase.

8577. While those sheep were being sent dead to this country were they for the consumption of London, or were they distributed through the country?—They went in the neighbourhood of London as well.

8578. Have you sent them into the country any distance?—No, they went into the Metropolitan Market here, and there they were sold. A great many, I believe, were sold at the wharf. They were not sent into the country for sale; they were all sold in London.

8579. Not recommending a system which you think would diminish the supply; that is to say, slaughter at the port of embarkation, have you considered the other question, whether it would be necessary, in consequence of your feeling that inspection is not a security, to slaughter at the port of debarkation?—Yes, I think that the whole foreign trade would be very much better and much steadier, and the supply would be more regular, if all foreign animals were obliged to be slaughtered at the port of debarkation.

8580. Then you are in favour of slaughter at the port?—Yes.

8581. Would that be universally applied to all foreign countries?—Yes, I think so. I would apply it, because there are none of them free from disease.

8582. What would you do with regard to Denmark, for instance?—Denmark is pretty free; we had one cargo this year with foot-and-mouth disease.

8583. That is the only instance in which we have had any record of complaint against Denmark for some little time, I think?—Yes; but I understand from the evidence given here that Sweden sends over a good deal of store stock into Denmark. Now Sweden is not free from foot-and-mouth disease.

8584. The evidence that we had from the Danish witness, I think, went to show that although Sweden had done so, fresh regulations had been made recently upon that point, and that therefore Denmark had protected itself against the introduction of that disease from Sweden?—I did not understand so.

8585. Under the circumstances, seeing that they represent, and I suppose truly, that they have not had cattle plague in that country for a century, and they have had only three instances of pleuro-pneumonia, in which it was stamped out as soon as it showed itself on the farm on which it originated, and that foot-and-mouth disease had been only sent over here in one instance, would you apply the same restrictions with regard to Danish cattle as you would apply to other foreign cattle?—I think that I would make no difference with regard to Denmark. It would make practically in my opinion no difference in the supply here. The Committee have

Chairman—continued.

heard a good deal of the loss of sending cattle to Deptford for slaughter; I do not believe in it, and it is a curious fact that although most of the cattle countries are now scheduled, those that are free now to send into the country, that is to say Sweden and Denmark, and Spain and Portugal have sent us less the last six months, having the Metropolitan Market free, and not having the competition of the Dutch and the German cattle coming from Deptford, than they sent us last year.

8586. You believe that if the whole of the foreign cattle were slaughtered at the port of debarkation, it would produce so much more regularity in the trade, that the objections to the market would be considerably lessened?—Yes. The market is not what you would call a market now; for weeks there will be nothing there. Since it was opened in 1872 for weeks there was nothing there, and then perhaps there were 20, 30, or 50 beasts. Then would come a time when a cargo of sheep, from either Germany or Holland would be stopped, and they would have to go to Deptford; so that they would have to go and beg the buyers to go down and buy them.

8587. So that the paucity of buyers in the market now really arises from the uncertainty of the trade?—Yes; the trade is getting into a settled state, and there are plenty of buyers down there now.

8588. In consequence of the restrictions which have driven a greater number of cattle into that market?—Yes; I have the number of butchers that have slaughter-houses; there are 26 wholesale butchers who have slaughter-houses hired from the Corporation annually at Deptford, and the Corporation have four for the use of the public, in which any one can slaughter an animal, and they are constructing five more.

8589. It has been stated to the Committee that the small retail butcher did not find it worth his while to establish a slaughter-house there, and that practically, therefore, the trade was in the hands of those few men who had established slaughter-houses; is that so?—Yes, that is so; very few of them go down there. When Schleswig-Holstein cattle were sent to Deptford, in 1872, some did go down; but I think it would be a very good thing for London if the small slaughter-houses were done away with, for they must be very injurious to health in the case of any epidemic. They can go down there if they please, and one of those men that has a slaughter-house there actually now and then takes cattle from the Metropolitan Market to Deptford for slaughter; he does not take them to any extent, but he has done so.

8590. You represent that the uncertainty of the market really produces the evil complained of; that is to say, the want of competition, and that by making it absolutely a market for the slaughter of all animals coming from abroad, you would create a trade there which would bring the competition at once to it?—Yes. With the exception, perhaps, of Denmark, all the other counties are diseased.

8591. Does that apply to Spain and Portugal?—Yes.

8592. It has been stated before this Committee that Spain and Portugal were practically free from those diseases?—They were up to 1873. All the time I was an importer from there, which was for a great many years, I do not recollect a single

Chairman—continued

single case of disease; but in 1874 the foot-and-mouth complaint broke out in Portugal, and out of 42 cargoes imported into London and Southampton (because I include Southampton as being the port of London), 13 were stopped for foot-and-mouth complaint. In 1875, out of 58 cargoes imported, four were stopped; in 1876, out of 61 cargoes imported, 11 were stopped. In 1874, there were 29 cargoes, consisting of 5,700 animals, which passed as sound; and 13 cargoes consisting of 2,789 animals were stopped as having disease.

8593. You represent, therefore, that Spain and Portugal are not as free from those diseases as Denmark is, and therefore that those countries have not the same claim as Denmark might have to send cattle free?—No.

8594. We have not had instances of this complaint being produced from the cattle from Schleswig, have we?—We had two cargoes in 1874 or 1875 stopped for foot-and-mouth disease, but no others.

8595. The Schleswig cattle proper that are fed in that country and sent to this country are usually a perfectly healthy supply, are they not?—Yes; the only thing now is that Schleswig and Holstein are open to the entire of Germany. Previously to this the German Government passed some local regulations that stopped it, but now I understand that they have positively refused to make any special arrangements about it, and therefore the cattle can be sent in from Germany to Schleswig-Holstein. Under our Privy Council regulations, by this new order they could not export, because a man has to make a declaration that he has had them in his possession a certain time, but it does not prevent anyone sending them into Schleswig-Holstein.

8596. But Schleswig, as I understand, is a grazing country, and they feed off on the grass the animals that they get from Denmark principally, and supply us with those animals?—Yes.

8597. And, therefore, with proper precautions, the diseased German cattle need not come through the Schleswig trade?—No; but last year they had a good deal of foot-and-mouth complaint, I have understood, in Schleswig-Holstien, but the farmers are so much interested in putting a stop to it, that they have prevented it reaching us. Their cattle are inspected previously to shipment. They stop any diseased cattle from coming here.

8598. The real fact that interests us in the matter is that we have not had any of these diseases imported from Schleswig into this country?—No.

8599. That being the case, and Denmark, also, being, as you have described, free, notwithstanding that, you think that, for the benefit of the trade generally, there ought to be no distinction, and that they ought all to be slaughtered at the port of debarkation?—Yes. In 1872, when Schleswig-Holstein was scheduled, we got more cattle from there than we did in the previous year or the year after.

8600. In the year when they went to Deptford?—Yes.

8601. You mean to represent that, as showing that the restrictions which you suggest of slaughter at the port would not in any way alter the current of trade as between the two countries?—Yes; my experience of it is pretty well this: that when I have had cattle stopped, and sent to Deptford, when there was other cattle to

Chairman—continued.

sell there, there was very little difference between the value there and in the Metropolitan Market.

8602. I suppose, from your experience of carrying the dead meat which you describe, there is no difficulty in its being slaughtered at Deptford, and in supplying from Deptford the towns through the country with dead meat?—Up to the last two or three weeks there were parties from Manchester and from Birmingham, and other places, who bought very largely at Deptford, and slaughtered sheep there and took them into the country. Little or no horned cattle has gone to Deptford up to the present time except calves since the beginning of the year. The Dutch supply has not commenced yet.

8603. That is in consequence of the German supply being prohibited, and the other supplies not being in season, as I understand?—Yes. They go there, and they buy the sheep, and they slaughter them, and they have what no wholesale butcher in the town has; they have vans where they can hang the carcases up from hooks, and then they have trucks on the railways with hooks to hang them up by, and they take them down to Manchester and Birmingham, so that they are there ready for the market the first thing in the morning.

8604. You corroborate then what Sir Alexander Wood, the deputy chairman of the Great Western Railway, told us, as to the possibility of sending the sheep long distances from the Deptford Market?—Yes; it has been regularly done since the commencement of the season up to within a week or two, when the supply fell off, as it always does at this time of the year; although curiously enough more German sheep came in in the last few weeks in May and June than came last year during the same time, notwithstanding the prohibition and notwithstanding the slaughter at Deptford.

8605. Therefore it would appear that the fact of the slaughter does not diminish the supply to this country?—Not at all; it would rather increase it, I think.

8606. And you think that making it uniformly a market where those foreign animals had to be slaughtered would tend to improve the price, from the fact of a better trade being created?—A steadier market, a steadier supply, and a steadier price.

8607. I understand what your views are with regard to the import of foreign animals from abroad. Have you considered the question of what ought to be done with the stores from abroad?—With the exception of milch cows, which we get mainly from Holland, we get no store cattle.

8608. You get no number of stores of any importance?—None at all; there are cattle sent over here that are not half fat, and sometimes when they are sold very cheap when there is a depressed market some venturesome man on account of the price may buy them for stores; but as a rule no store cattle come over here except when the hay crop in Holland fails, then they hold on to the animals until they are almost starved, and then they send them here and sell them for whatever they fetch; that has only occurred two or three times since the trade opened in 1843.

8609. I believe that the store import is about 10,000?—Yes, from 8,000 to 12,000 cows.

8610. And

Mr. *Robinson.*

29 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

8610. And of those the larger proportion you state are for the purpose of the dairies?—Yes.

8611. You state that you consider that the inspection is unsatisfactory and unsuccessful for the purpose of protecting us from foreign disease; how would you propose to deal with these store animals that come over for dairy purposes?—They are not wanted for breeding purposes, but only for milk, and the reason they are bought for milk is because a dairyman can buy three Dutch cows for what he would have to pay for two English cows; of course the three give rather more milk than two, and they grow in this country into fair animals; but the supply is so small that arrangements might be made, say, at Thames Haven and at Harwich, and down the river, to quarantine them for any given time. You might bring over a cargo of, say, 200 or 300 animals and quarantine them for three or four weeks, or whatever length of time you might think desirable, and then let them go free.

8612. You think that the trade is so limited a trade that all the dangers of quarantining, which I daresay you are as well aware of as anybody, might be got over with regard to the few animals that were wanted for that purpose?—Yes; it is only the temptation of the low price of the Dutch cows that induces many dairymen to buy them; and many of the men that buy them take care to isolate them for some time before they mix them with their own stock; so that if any of them drop with pleuro-pneumonia they kill them at once, or if they are taken with the foot-and-mouth complaint they keep them isolated until they are free from it.

8613. It has been stated to the Committee that a good deal of the possibility of disease might arise from the introduction of these animals into the dairies from the constant changes in those dairies that would ensue from sending the animal into the market the moment it became a little infected; do you think they quarantine them themselves before sending them over?—No; they are bought in the market and sent down to the vessel and embarked at once and sent over. The Dutch cattle, particularly cattle shipped from the neighbourhood of the distilleries round Schiedom, are very subject to pleuro-pneumonia.

8614. Is that from their feeding?—From their feeding, and altogether; I do not see how Holland can be free from pleuro-pneumonia; they shut up all the cattle for six months; in fact, they have them you may say in the house; because they have only to open the door from the dwelling part of the house into the stable where the cattle are; they are under the same roof, and in order to get the hay and all under cover they have the roof very low and the cattle are kept very warm. I have been in one of those places; in the month of May they exhaust their hay crop, and the moment they can they turn the cattle out into the fields, and then they have not a bit of shelter, and I wonder that more of them do not get diseased.

8615. You describe the possibility of so much disease amongst these animals, but you think that nevertheless we should be safe in admitting them for dairy purposes under quarantine?—You would want a very strict quarantine.

8616. I understood you to say that you would have a quarantine of one month?—I have no experience of pleuro-pneumonia, though I, unfortunately, have had experience of foot-and-mouth disease in a small way.

Chairman—continued.

8617. It has been stated that the time of incubation of pleuro-pneumonia is a very long one, and that one month would probably be no guarantee against the introduction of pleuro-pneumonia; is that your view?—I cannot speak as to that.

8618. You are acquainted with the Irish trade also, are you not?—Yes.

8619. Can you speak as to the carrying of that trade from Ireland?—Yes, I can speak of it from the time when we used to send the cattle over from Dublin to Liverpool in sailing vessels, in collier brigs. We slung them from off the quay from the masthead down into the hold. After that the steamers took them, and we used to have to sling them into the hold of the steamers and out of it again at Liverpool. I was engaged in that for 10 or 12 years, and I never heard of such a thing as foot-and-mouth disease or pleuro-pneumonia in that time. I have seen 2,500 pigs turned out of one vessel, and lots from the north of Ireland, and there was not a bit of foot-and-mouth disease of any sort for years.

8620. Was that under conditions as to transit, which would now perhaps not be considered so satisfactory?—They would not ship them at all now in that way. The steamers took half as long to make the voyage. If they got into Liverpool in 14 or 15 hours they considered it very quick, and if they lost their tide they had to wait in the river until the next tide, before they could get into dock to land, because as I have already stated, the cattle were obliged to be slung into and out of the hold. Now they take them across in nine or ten hours, and if they are late for the tide they go alongside the stage and walk them all out.

8621. I understand that the idea that these diseases are generated by treatment in the passage is not borne out by your experience?—I do not believe it at all.

8622. And you think that if the animals suffer from foot-and-mouth disease or pleuro-pneumonia, it must be in the system before they start rather than be developed by the passage?—Yes, and from the treatment which they get after they are landed and sold. The Irish dealers are quite alive to it, particularly now, with regard to foot-and-mouth disease, because if a farmer can guarantee that his cattle have had the foot-and-mouth disease within a reasonable time he will get a better price; a man will buy them more readily because they will stand until he gets rid of them.

8623. One witness was asked a question as to whether he was aware of a system of inoculating for the disease; is that the reason why they inoculate for the disease in order to give the guarantee?—No, there are generalty two men employed in it; one is a buyer in the country and the other attends the stock over to England, and he hands them over at Bristol or at Liverpool, or wherever it is, to salesmen there, and he goes with them. All the large dealers have fields, and they rest them wherever they possibly can; it is only when a fair is near the port that they are taken to it at once; and after all the distances that the cattle are driven in Ireland are not what they are here.

8624. There is no reason, you think, why, with proper regulations, these diseases should not

Chairman—continued.

not be got rid of in Ireland?—None whatever, I think.

8625. You do not believe, as I understand you, that there is any foundation for the assertion that the disease itself is engendered in the transit?—No; if they catch a man attempting to ship diseased animals he is prosecuted; that is not done here. Again, there is another great check; all the steamboat companies in the south of Ireland insure the cattle, and they take right good care, as far as they can, not to take any sick or diseased or lame animal on board, because they run the risk of having to pay for it; and they insure them at such an amount that it is a premium to men to have them killed on board the vessel; they insure them at a higher rate than they are worth in the market.

8626. With regard to slaughter at the port of landing, you have stated that you think that the dead-meat market at Deptford would be an improving trade if all foreign animals were obliged to be slaughtered there; you would apply that regulation to foreign animals in the defined ports through the country as well as to London?—Yes.

8627. And you think that the certainty that they must be slaughtered at the ports would produce an even trade, and therefore a paying trade, at those ports?—No doubt. I may point out the uncertainty of the trade here: a vessel starts from Rotterdam, and she has to land her cargo at Thames Haven; she arrives at Thames Haven on the Saturday evening, and they are out of quarantine on the Sunday morning, and are expected to be up at the market. The salesman goes down to the Metropolitan Market expecting to find his cattle there, and he ascertains that they are stopped at Thames Haven, and then he has to come down to me, or to others, to send a vessel down to Thames Haven to bring them up to Deptford for slaughter; so that the man that receives them does not know whether he will have them in the market, or where he will have them; and that uncertainty is a great drawback to the trade. In fact, I fancy that it has driven some men out of the trade.

8628. With regard to a point upon which you gave evidence before, and which has again been raised before this Committee, you stated that you had had experience of the carriage of dead meat from abroad during the time that the restrictions prevented the cattle from coming alive; from your experience, have you been able to supply the offal as well as the dead meat?—Yes, we brought the offal over with the dead meat.

8629. In any quantities?—Yes, in considerable quantities.

8630. In answer to a question which was put to you in 1873, you stated that you had brought over a cargo of 3,000 dead sheep, with the whole of their offals with them in the same cargo?—Yes.

8631. Have you ever had experience since of the carriage of offal?—No, the dead meat that comes over now is, generally speaking, the prime parts; we bring over no offal, mostly the hind-quarters of the sheep from Holland.

8632. Was it possible to bring that offal over in such a condition as to place it upon the market here for consumption sound?—Yes, they send offal down to Manchester or Birmingham now. Those dealers who buy the sheep at Deptford send the offal with them.

Chairman—continued.

8633. When the towns send up to purchase at the Deptford Market, do they carry down the offal as well as the carcase?—They do.

8634. And that goes down in sufficiently good order to compete with fresh-killed offal at the slaughterhouses of the town?—Yes.

8635. Do you state that from absolute experience?—Yes.

8636. Therefore there would be, in your opinion, no difficulty in meeting that great demand on the part of the large number of the population of this town for offal if the animal had to be slaughtered at Deptford?—None whatever.

8637. It could be carried, and might compete just as well as if it was slaughtered in private slaughterhouses?—Yes; the wholesale man at Whitchapel does not sell the offal as a rule; he sells a little of it, but he sells the bulk to a retailer who takes it away; if he has to take it away from Whitechapel he can just as readily take it away from Deptford.

8638. But you go further, because you say that men who purchase the dead meat for the inland towns, carry down for sale in those towns the offal of the animals which they purchase?—Yes.

8639. And that shows that the offal will bear a railway journey of a considerable distance without sustaining such injury as to prevent its being saleable?—Yes. It has been stated over and over again that if you slaughter meat at Deptford it does not fetch the same price in the market as if it were slaughtered at the private slaughterhouses. It is very hard to disprove a thing of that kind, though it seems ridiculous; but one fact is this, that none of the slaugtermen have taken the slightest precaution to provide conveyances to bring up the meat in the best condition, but they put it into waggons, and pile the carcases one on the top of the other, and bring it up from the slaughterhouse; if they lost a farthing per pound upon a bullock by the difference of slaughtering at one place or at another, I think they would take more precautions than they do now; if you see meat hung up in a shop in Paris, it has been killed at an abattoir outside, and it is as fresh and as nice looking as if it had been killed at the back of the house, because they carry it there hung up in a conveyance in which it is not packed one piece on the other.

8640. Therefore, with proper regulations, there is nothing to prevent animals being slaughtered at the port, and the carcases and the offal, or any part of them that may be required for consumption inland, being carried inland without injury?—Nothing whatever, in my opinion.

8641. That is your experience, extending over a number of years in the trade?—Yes.

8642. And you having, at the time of those restrictions being in force, largely imported this offal into the country?—Yes.

8643. Have you had any experience in the American dead-meat trade?—No; it is only since it has cropped up so much that I have gone into the question a little, and examined how it comes. It strikes me that, although we have hitherto been almost at a standstill for a supply of meat from abroad, America is going to supply the want in this country.

8644. Supposing the conditions to be carried out, of a proper means of conveying the dead meat from America, you think that the trade will be a continuous one?—It is quite clear that it

Mr. *Robinson.*

29 June 1877.

Chairman—continued.

can be done, and that it has been done. It has been stated in evidence that it can pay at 6½ *d.* per pound. From what information I have been able to gather, I fancy that there would be no loss to the man if it were sold at 4½ *d.* per pound, in consequence of the price of the live animals and the cost of conveyance. It was given in evidence here that the live animals sold for 30 *l.* apiece which, was about 5 *s.* 6 *d.* per stone of eight pounds. Then the freight on that animal is 7 *l.* 10 *s.*, and I have been informed that they cost about 16 *l.* over there. At all events, there is the fact of a Dutch cattle-dealer having gone over from here, and having made an arrangement with a Dutch steam company to bring over live cattle for him; he went across, and he brought two cargoes, which came in bad condition, because I think he lost 16 out of one lot, and he quarrelled with them. He has made an arrangement with another steam company, the Anchor Line, which runs to London, and he has gone out himself, and taken out five men with him, and he is going to ship them regularly, and I understand that he has made a profit of quite 5 *l.* apiece on them by bringing them over alive; so that if you take a profit of 5 *l.* on the animals alive, and the freight is 7 *l.* 10 *s.*, and they are sold for 30 *l.* apiece, that would reduce the cost of the animal on the other side to 17 *l.* 10 *s.* I have been told that good ones have been bought at 16 *l.* If you take 110 stone at 4½ *d.* per pound, that will be 16 *l.* 10 *s.*, and then, putting the offal down at about 4 *l.*, that would be 20 *l.* 10 *s.*, and the freight is 2 *l.* 15 *s.*, or about ¾ *d.* per pound. That leaves 17 *l.* 15 *s.* for the dead animal as against 17 *l.* 10 *s.* for the live animal, without profit, so that anything which the dead meat fetches over 4¼ *d.* per pound would be profit. I have here a memorandum of the 25th May 1877. American beef, hind-quarters, at 5 *s.* 4 *d.*, and fore-quarters, 3 *s.* 4 *d.* at Smithfield market that morning. This is, on an average, 4 *s.* 4 *d.* der stone, or 6½ *d.* per pound all round. I see by the Customs' Report, that the White Star steamers carry about 1,200 quarters every voyage, and a captain of one of the steamers told me that they have always brought it in in perfect condition. The National Company coming to London always bring the meat in in perfect condition. If it gets out of order it is owing to the ice failing, or to the machinery breaking down, or to the treatment of it after it comes out of the vessel here. Now, I understand that they are about to spend several thousands of pounds down the river to form a depôt for storing this American meat so as to send it up as it is wanted. I thought at one time that it was a mere attempt on the part of the Americans to sell patents, and I did not follow the thing. I am speaking of the dead-meat trade; the live-meat trade has been tried for two years in Glasgow to a certain extent.

8645. The live-meat trade, I suppose, is a trade which is practical and remunerative in the summer months when you are not liable to rough weather?—It is, no doubt; but they tried it, and they found when the autumn came that they lost too many of them; and, from my experience in the Oporto trade, and in the cattle trade generally, my opinion is that they will not be able to carry over those live animals late in the autumn and through the winter with safety, in consequence of the weather. I speak from experience, having had a line of steamers running to New

Chairman—continued.

York for years, and we know that they come in knocked all to pieces sometimes, and of course when the vessel has her bulwarks knocked away, and her boats carried away, the cattle must suffer.

8646. You believe that the dead-meat trade will be perfected, and that it will be found to be a so much better trade, that it will take the place of the live import?—Yes, I believe it will be a large trade.

Mr. *Assheton.*

8647. You told us just now that when the trade in live animals was entirely stopped in 1868, there was still a considerable trade in dead meat carried on to this country, but in a very much smaller degree than that which was carried on in live stock?—Yes.

8648. Do you think that if the restrictions on the live stock had gone on for some little time longer the dead meat trade would have revived so as to have approached the same pitch that the live trade had attained to?—No, I do not think it would.

8649. I understand, however, that you do not contemplate returning to killing the animals on the other side of the water, but you prefer having them brought to Deptford, and slaughtered there?—Yes.

8650. I presume, then, that the great diminution in 1866 can hardly be taken as a test of any diminution which would ensue by slaughtering all the animals at Deptford?—No, not at all, I think.

8651. Do you think that if it was suddenly made the law that all animals were to be slaughtered at Deptford, or at some other port of debarkation, there would be a great diminution in the quantity of cattle sent?—No, I do not think there would; because, taking this year for instance, Holland was scheduled in the beginning of January, and up to the end of March last year we brought 6,733 beasts from Holland; I am speaking of oxen. This year, although Holland was scheduled, we imported 6,610 into London, which shows a falling off of only 123 beasts in the first three months in the year with slaughtering at Deptford, as compared with letting them go free. The import of cattle altogether in 1876 and 1877 into London up to the end of May, including what comes into Harwich, and Southampton, and Queenbrough (because I consider that they are parts of the port of London), was 36,908 beasts. This year there were 24,781 beasts. Then I account for the difference in this way; there were 2,515 milking cows imported last year, and this year there were none imported at all; then I imported 1,666 beasts from Corunna last year, and I did not import any at all this year. Then the Oporto supply is some 400 less this year, or rather more; then there is the German supply, which is prohibited and last year we imported 6,460; so that there is a total of 35,800 now, against 36,900 when the trade was free, except that it is obliging the French and German cattle to be slaughtered at Deptford.

8652. I suppose that there are a great many butchers in London who never kill cattle at all (though it sounds rather a curious thing to say), but who buy entirely at Deptford or at other dead markets?—That number is gradually increasing. They are giving up the practice of slaughtering them; they find that they can supply themselves better at the Metropolitan Market.

8653. And

Mr. *Assheton*—continued.

8653. And that is a class of butchers, is it not, that trade in the highest class of meat?—All classes, I fancy.

8654. I presume that to those butchers it does not matter whether the cattle they buy are slaughtered at Deptford or whether they are killed in other slaughter-houses?—Not the slightest; it is only a question of cost.

Mr. *Jacob Bright.*

8655. You spoke of the dead-meat trade that we had in 1865; at that time were not the live cattle prevented from going to other countries as well as to this country, in consequence of the plague?—I am not aware.

8656. You have been a large importer of cattle yourself?—Yes, I have been in the import trade for years.

8657. You have a strong opinion in favour of killing everything at Deptford?—Yes.

8658. When you imported largely yourself, as you did, I suppose, from uncheduled countries sometimes, did you ever take your cattle to Deptford to be slaughtered?—Not unless I was compelled.

8659. You preferred other modes of disposing of them?—Yes, on account of its being a restricted market. There is another point with regard to Deptford which is a very serious one, and that is that the Government require their contractors, as a rule, to deliver live animals for Aldershot and Portsmouth, and, I think, Chatham and different places. Now the principal buyers of foreign cattle are the Government contractors; therefore if the cattle are sent to Deptford, there is one buyer, a large buyer, and a good buyer, as a rule, shut out in consequence of the Government restrictions.

8660. But, although you have so high an opinion of the importance of slaughtering at Deptford, when you yourself had the option you never went to Deptford?—No.

Mr. *Murphy.*

8661. You stated that you had a general and probably, I apprehend, a particular acquaintance with the system of the shipment of cattle at the ports in Ireland?—Yes.

8662. You have an acquaintance, I take it for granted, with the port of Cork?—Yes.

8663. You are acquainted with the system of the shipment of cattle at the port of Cork?—Yes.

8664. Are you aware that no cattle are allowed to be shipped at Cork without being previously examined, and each beast branded with the Privy Council mark, by the vetinary surgeon appointed by the Pivy Council?—Yes.

8665. Are you aware that a series of pens have been fitted up close to the water side for the purpose of examing the cattle in?—Yes.

8666. In a yard immediately attached to the place of shipment?—Yes.

8667. And that immediately on the cattle leaving those pens for shipment after examination the pens are disinfected?—Yes.

8668. That a constant supply of water is laid on on the premises?—Yes.

8669. That the lairs and the ground are thoroughly washed and swept?—Yes, they are cleaned and disinfected.

8670. That chloride of lime and whitewash are freely used?—Yes.

Mr. *Murphy*—continued.

8671. That all straw and droppings are removed, and that no fresh cattle are allowed in until this process is gone through?—Yes.

8672. That a regular staff is provided by the steam ship company for this purpose?—Yes.

8673. That the cattle are then walked into the vessels which are at the quay, which is only a distance of 60 feet from the yard?—Yes, I know it is only across the quay.

8674. Are you aware what is the nature of the fittings in the vessels under the Order of the Privy Council?—Yes.

8675. You are aware, of course, that to prevent the possibility of overcrowding, the pens are obliged to be constructed according to the dimensions given by the Privy Council for that purpose?—Yes.

8676. I believe that 15 feet by 8 is about the smallest size?—That is the largest size.

8677. They can only hold a certain number of cattle; for instance, each pen can only hold five fat beasts?—It depends upon the size of them.

8678. They will hold about eight two-year-olds and about eleven yearlings?—I think that must be wrong.

8679. Are you aware also that the ships, when they are loading, are watched by the constabulary, who are told off by the Privy Council for that purpose to see that there is no overcrowding?—Yes, the Privy Council Inspector has always two or three policemen attending on him, and these men go on board the vessel and examine her before the cattle are shipped and they look after the shipment. Then the great point of safety, in my opinion, is that the company insure the cattle, and if they kill them, they have to pay for them, and sharply, too.

8680. You are aware, I believe, or at least if you are not yourself aware, you may have heard, that the officials of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals are very particularly vigilant in that regard, and that they have made complaints on the subject which probably were made from the very best motives, but which in their zeal they have a little over-coloured?—I am not aware of anything of that kind.

8681. Are you aware that in consequence of the regulations of the Privy Council, and the impossibility of more than a certain number of cattle being allowed to be shipped on any one vessel at Cork, it has been frequently the case that supernumerary vessels have been obliged to be put on to take the additional quantity of cattle coming for shipment?—Yes.

8682. Have you ever heard that two supernumerary vessels have been put on from Cork to Bristol on the same day?—I am not aware of more than one.

8683. With regard to insurance, I believe that the custom is this: that the cattle-dealer, after his cattle have been examined (and not allowed to go on board without being free from every disease), is allowed by the company to insure each head of cattle, either against loss by death occurring on board, or against the cattle not being landed in a proper state at the port of debarkation, and that he pays a certain percentage of insurance on the value of the beasts?—Yes, I am aware that that is so.

8684. And that, in fact, the owner of the cattle can make the company liable for any loss sustained by damage to those cattle in transit?—Yes.

Mr. *Robinson.*

29 June 1877.

Mr. *Murphy*—continued.

8685. Therefore, as you say, they for their own sakes (we will not talk about higher motives, but from selfish motives) take every possible precaution that the vessel is not over-crowded, that the cattle are delivered with safety, and that they have proper attendance, proper food, and proper ventilation?—Yes.

8686. From all the experience that you have had, can you suggest the possibility of any greater amount of preparation or precaution being taken as to the arrangement and treatment of the cattle in their transit than does take place at the port of Cork?—I do not know that they can do anything more than they do; some of the vessels go 14 knots an hour, they are well ventilated and very expensive; and if I were to be asked to construct a vessel for the conveyance of cattle, and given *carte blanche*, I do not know how I could improve upon most of the present ships which are employed in conveying cattle between Ireland and England.

8687. You are aware, are you not, that the Cork Steamship Company have had vessels expressly built for the purpose in Newcastle?—Yes, I have a general knowledge of the whole of the Irish cattle trade and the ships connected with it, both north and south.

8688. If cattle should happen to die in transit, that must necessarily occur from stress of weather and from the fatigue of the voyage?—Not necessarily, because sometimes they die without any stress of weather.

8689. The log-book is the proper place to refer to, to ascertain if a casualty has occurred, whether the weather has been bad?—Yes.

Mr. *Elliot.*

8690. Have you brought the meat in hot weather as well as in cold weather from abroad?—Not in the height of summer.

8691. Did you lose any meat by deterioration?—Sometimes it came over rather deteriorated.

8692. You did not use any ice, did you?—No, we packed them in the hold, one on the top of the other. If the weather was very damp or close, more particularly if it was wet, it suffered more.

8693. We were talking of store cattle; there is a quarantine at Harwich now, is there not?—I do not think that there is a licensed quarantine ground, but they have plenty of space for it; they have ground where, when cargoes of milch cows have arrived, and they have been stopped for foot-and-mouth disease; the owners objected to have them slaughtered, and they arranged with the Privy Council and got permission to quarantine them there, and they kept them there until they were sound.

8694. Are you not aware that there have been cattle killed at Harwich, rather than that they should be kept there for 14 days' quarantine?—Yes.

8695. You do not agree with the last witness, who said that he would recommend a two months' quarantine; you think that it would not pay?—I do not think that it would.

8696. Can you tell the Committee what the difference between the freight of live animals and dead animals is from Germany?—The dead meat from Hamburg is brought at about 2 *s.* 6 *d.* to 3 *s.* per quarter; that is from 10 *s.* to 12 *s.* a-head, and the freight of live animals is about 20 *s.* In Holland it varies from 30 *s.* per ton up to 70 *s.* per ton, so that, practically, there is not much difference.

Mr. *Elliot*—continued.

8697. You made a statement as to the American shippers, and you said that if they could get it over here at 4½ *d.* per pound, you thought they could sell it at a profit?—No, I said I thought they could sell it without loss.

8698. What could a man from Germany, sending cattle over here, afford to sell them at without loss?—I have no idea. In putting down the 4½ *d.* per pound, I am calculating a profit of 5 *l.* upon a live animal, and I am not calculating any profit upon the dead meat, that makes the difference. I have understood, first that they have sold here at a profit of 5 *l.*; then I have understood also that they have bought there at the price of 16 *l.* I have heard a witness say that he sold the cattle at 30 *l.*; so that if I take the freight off, which is 7 *l.* 10 *s.*, and the 5 *l.* for the profit, it brings it to 17 *l.* 10 *s.* as against 16 *l.*; so that it is pretty correct I think. Then valuing the animal on the other side either at 16 *l.* or 17 *l.* 10 *s.*, 4½ *d.* per pound, here will clear them.

Mr. *King Harman.*

8699. In your evidence in 1873 you spoke of the way in which the meat was brought up from Deptford, and you said, "I have seen a man sitting in a cart of meat upon the top of a calf, with his arms upon the brisket of the calf, as if he were in an arm-chair;" do you mean to tell the Committee that they go on pretty much in the same way still, and that there is no improvement?—There is no improvement.

8700. You have a good deal of knowledge of the Spanish trade, I think?—Yes.

8701. In 1873 Professor Simonds gave evidence to the effect that he believed the number of cattle in Spain was decreasing, and that in a very short time they would not have any surplus stock for exportation; do you think that that is the case now?—I think, judging from the exports that we have got from Portugal, from Oporto, it seems to be a very stationary trade, because the cattle there are only fed in pairs by the farmers in a limited district, and they are working oxen fed in pairs; there are no large herds kept.

Mr. *Norwood.*

8702. Are you aware that the importation of live cattle from New York has very greatly increased this year to Hull, Southampton, Liverpool, and London?—Yes, it has considerably.

8703. Have you seen any of those animals when they were landed?—No, I have not.

8704. Are you aware that they arrive in very good condition as a rule?—Very good.

8705. And yet, as I understand, you would prohibit those animals from coming alive?—Yes, I think so, because there was a very suspicious cargo at Southampton some little time ago; they stopped them for some days, and the Privy Council had a great consultation; they did not pass them for four or five days, I think; and in a country like America, of so large an extent as it is, and with a very varying climate, between winter and summer, I think if you treat pleuro-pneumonia as a disease, it must exist there.

8706. But the Privy Council passed the cattle that you talk about, did they not?—They did; but they set them down as having inflammation of

Mr. *Norwood*—continued.

of the lungs. I am sure I do not know what is the difference between pleuro-pneumonia and inflammation of the lungs.

8707. Do you believe that a trade in dead meat, packed in ice, is practicable from the Continent in a pecuniary point of view?—No; I think that you will have to alter the trade altogether in order to bring it to that.

8708. Would it pay pecuniarily to go through the expensive process of erecting these meat safes and getting the ice to convey meat a 24 hours' journey to England?—That would only have to be done supposing that we were driven to it; supposing that we were driven to prohibit the import of all foreign cattle alive, the people would then lay themselves out for a dead-meat trade. For three or four months in the height of the summer I think that you would have very little to bring over; then when the cold weather came, from the north of Europe you might, but certainly from the south, from Portugal and Spain, I do not see that you could have any arrangement about it, because you would have to import the ice there. I do not think any of the Spanish or Portuguese people would go into that trade; it would have to be done by English men, but I do not think that the trade would ever pay.

8709. In point of fact, it would be too expensive an operation for the near ports to enter upon that safe and ice affair?—I think that to a certain extent it would, although we must bear in mind that all through the season there is a large amount of bacon made in Hamburg; they kill the pigs in the height of summer, and cure them, and send the bacon here the same as they do in Ireland from Waterford; in the summer they send 4,000 or 5,000 bales a week.

Colonel *Kingscote.*

8710. But they bring many dead carcases of sheep over from abroad, do they not?—Not at this time of the year; it ceases practically in April, and it begins again at the end of September or at the beginning of October.

Colonel *Kingscote*—continued.

Mr. *Arthur Peel.*

8711. What do these companies which carry the Irish cattle insure the cattle against; do they insure them against death as well as injury?—Yes; death and injury.

8712. You said that they insured their cattle at a higher rate than their value in the market?—Yes, as a rule.

8713. But, taking that statement by itself, there is no motive whatever on the part of the shippers to look after the safety of the cattle, for whether they die or live they get paid?—The steam company take right good care of that; they look after them; their men on board the vessel look after them as well as the people who are with them.

8714. The best test of the treatment would be the premiums of insurance, I suppose; what are the rates?—One shilling and sixpence on an animal, up to 20 *l.*; and 2 *s.* on an animal up to 25 *l.* to Liverpool. A sheep is only 4 *d.* Those are are rather high rates, I think.

Chairman.

8715. You stated, in answer to a question that you went to the Islington Market in preference to Deptford during the time that you were importing; I understood you to say that was in consequence of what you have described as want of competition in the Deptford Market, which you believe would be altered by the system which you suggest of making it universally a foreign market?—Yes, there were no cattle there very often but what I had there.

8716. And that uncertainty was what prevented your taking your cargoes there, and forced you into the Islington Market?—Decidedly.

Monday, 2nd July 1877.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Major Allen.	Colonel Kingscote.
Mr. Chaplin.	Sir Rainald Knightley.
Mr. Dease.	Mr. M'Lagan.
Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.	Mr. Murphy.
Mr. Elliot.	Mr. Norwood.
Mr. W. E. Forster.	Mr. Arthur Peel.
Mr. French.	Mr. Ritchie.
Mr. John Holms.	Sir Henry Selwin Ibbetson.
Mr. King-Harman.	Mr. Torr.

SIR HENRY SELWIN IBBETSON, BART., IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. JAMES MELVIN, called in; and Examined.

Mr. *Melvin.*

2 July 1877.

Chairman.

8717. I BELIEVE you are the President of the Scotch Chamber of Agriculture?—I am.

8718. Does that chamber represent a large number of the counties in Scotland?—We have 23 members on the direction, and most of them are from different counties in Scotland. We generally choose a member from each county.

8719. Therefore you, speaking for the Scotch Chamber, represent to this Committee the views of the farmers of a large number of counties of Scotland?—I believe so.

8720. You yourself, I believe, are a practical farmer to some considerable extent?—Yes; I pay 1,800 *l.* a year in rent.

8721. Is your farm principally a sheep-farm, or do you graze cattle there?—I breed Border Leicester sheep, and I fatten cattle which I purchase for fattening purposes.

8722. Do you fat off in the year any great amount of cattle?—About a hundred.

8723. I think you have been for some years engaged in the New Zealand and Australian Land Company?—I am director of that Company, and I have been so for eleven years, since it was formed.

8724. That company farm to a very large extent, do they not?—Yes; they have about 600,000 sheep; they have 2,500,000 acres of Crown lands on lease, and they have about 250,000 or 260,000 acres of purchased lands.

8725. You superintended the valuation of that property for the Company, did you not?—Yes.

8726. Have you any knowledge of the working of it, and of the shipment of the animals there?—Yes; I had the control over the selection of the live stock, under our general manager in Glasgow, Mr. Morton.

8727. Have you yourself, in your own herd, had any experience of the contagious diseases, which are referred to the consideration of this Committee?—Yes, I have had a great deal of experience of them.

8728. Have you suffered in your herds from cattle plague?—Not on the farm that I now hold, and which I have held for 38 years; but I have

Chairman—continued.

on another farm, which I formerly farmed, in Mr. M'Lagan's county, Linlithgowshire.

8729. Was it during the great outbreak of 1865-66 that you suffered?—Yes.

8730. Have you had it since that time?—No.

8731. Have you suffered from other contagious diseases in your herds?—I have suffered from pleuro-pneumonia and from foot-and-mouth disease.

8732. Have you had pleuro-pneumonia often on your farm, or have you had much experience about it?—I have had pleuro-pneumonia for nine or 10 years before the cattle plague, almost every year, less or more; but since the cattle plague I have only had one attack of it.

8733. To what do you attribute its stoppage at that particular time?—To two causes. One cause is the change, in my own opinion, as to the infectious nature of the disease. Formerly, along with a number of the Scotch farmers, we held with Professor Dick, who was our veterinary professor, that pleuro-pneumonia was not so very contagious, and we were rather easy about the buying of cattle; we did not pay so much attention to that as we have since.

8734. Then you did not connect in any way the regulations which were then in force for the suppression of cattle plague in 1865-66 with the sudden cessation of attacks of pleuro-pneumonia upon your farm?—That and from being more careful in buying.

8735. Have you had foot-and-mouth disease amongst your sheep?—During the years 1871 to 1876 I had four attacks of foot-and-mouth disease amongst my cattle and two amongst my sheep.

8736. Did you suffer any great losses from those attacks?—I consider that during the four attacks I lost about 2 *l.* per head on my cattle, to the extent of a hundred cattle.

8737. Was that from pleuro-pneumonia or from foot-and-mouth disease?—From foot-and-mouth disease, not from pleuro-pneumonia.

8738. Was that loss in consequence of cattle going off in condition, and having to be brought again into that condition?—That was so.

8739. Have

Chairman—continued.

8739. Have you any dairy stock?—Not now.

8740. Then it was simply on account of the deterioration in condition?—It was simply on account of the deterioration in the condition of the cattle, and that I put at about 2 *l.* per head.

8741. For how long did it throw your cattle back?—I should say that the deterioration in condition was equivalent to a loss of about six weeks.

8742. Has the chamber to which you belong had its attention directed to this question of the cattle diseases?—Since the year 1865, when there was an outbreak of cattle plague, they have repeatedly had the subject before the directors, and at the general meetings.

8743. Have they represented their views to the Privy Council?—Repeatedly.

8744. What has been the resolution that they have come to as the result of their consideration at the different times which you have mentioned?—I may state that the last memorial which was psesented to a certain extent embodies the views that they have eventually been led to hold. Perhaps I may be permitted to read the prayer of the memorial which was drawn up in February.

8745. That was at the time of the last outbreak?—Yes, before it was ascertained positively that the rinderpest was in London. "In conclusion, your memorialists would respectfully urge upon your Grace that, in the face of a threatened importation of the cattle plague, which, if it has not already reached this country in a cargo lately imported at Deptford, is at present extending itself into western Europe, a favourable opportunity now exists for introducing the system advocated by your memorialists, which, it is admitted on all hands, would give the highest attainable degree of security against the introduction of these contagious and infectious diseases so destructive among the flocks and herds of this country, without as your memorialists believe, unduly interfering with that freedom of trade which is now recognised by all classes of the people as essential to the true interests and prosperity of the kingdom. Wherefore, may it please your Grace to give the matter your favourable consideration, and authorise such steps to be taken as may be deemed necessary to remove the wide-spread dissatisfaction that now prevails amongst agriculturists with the present system of requiring all foreign animals imported into this country to be slaughtered at the port of debarkation, or to do otherwise in the premises as to your Grace may seem fit."

8746. That was the result, as I understand you, of several considerations of these different diseases at different periods by your chamber?—Yes.

8747. They resulted finally, from the fear of the cattle plague breaking out again in England, on your sending that memorial to the Privy Council?—They did. I may mention that I have here copies of all the different memorials which we have presented.

8748. But that really embodies the result of those previous memorials?—Precisely so.

8749. Are those views of the chamber endorsed by other associations in Scotland?—They are so. I may mention that the district association of Mid-Calder, which has part of Mid-Lothian and part of Linlithgowshire as its bounds, took up the subject, and considered it at its general meeting, and the result was the presentation of a memorial to the House of Commons by Lord Dalkeith.

Chairman—continued.

8750. Was that a memorial to the same effect as the memorial which you sent to the Privy Council; does it also recommend slaughter at the port of debarkation?—The memorial is to this effect: "Your petitioners therefore humbly pray your Honourable House to take into serious consideration under the above circumstances, whether the importation of live stock, except as stated" (for breeding purposes, under certain conditions) "should not be entirely prohibited. Should this be impracticable, your petitioners are of opinion that a strict quarantine, of sufficient duration, under Government inspection, should be established at all the ports of debarkation. The enormous losses of late years amongst home stocks, which might be greatly lessened, if not entirely suppressed, were the above views adopted, induce your petitioners to pray your Honourable House to take this important subject into careful consideration."

8751. Do you represent that it is the view of the Scottish farmers generally that the foreign cattle imported should be slaughtered at the port of debarkation?—I believe it is.

8752. There has been of late a considerable introduction of lean stock from abroad into Scotland, has there not?—The number has diminished very much in comparison with what it was 20 or 25 years ago.

8753. The introduction of lean stock has been reduced of late years instead of increased?—It is almost entirely confined now to milch cows from Denmark, and some from Holland.

8754. But the introduction of those has been supported generally for some time, has it not, by Scotch farmers?—That memorial which I have just read is a convincing proof to me that the Scotch farmers do not wish for those cows.

8755. You think that the fear of the introduction of disease has caused them to alter the views which they formerly held as to the importation of those animals from Denmark, and that they now wish that foreign cattle should only come in as fat cattle, and that they should be slaughtered at the port?—I believe so. I may mention that this memorial is from the chief persons who purchase these cows in the dairy district west of Edinburgh.

8756. Then the view which you express would not be shared by the owners of dairies in the towns?—I cannot speak as to that.

8757. Do you believe that they are largely dependent upon this importation for the supply of their dairies?—I think that they would be far better without it.

8758. Could that supply be met in any other way than by introducing those cows from Denmark?—I think that if we were clear of these infectious diseases, there would be better cattle bred and kept in the country than there are.

8759. And do you think that the want that they now feel for those cattle would be superseded by the increased breeding of stock for dairy purposes in the country itself?—I believe that it would be so in Scotland.

8760. Do you think that those dairy cows increase the danger of the spread of pleuro-pneumonia?—The Dutch cows especially do so.

8761. Do they import many Dutch cows into Scotland?

Mr. *Melvin.*

2 July 1877.

Chairman—continued.

Scotland?—There are a considerable number brought over, but I am not exactly sure as to the number.

8762. Is it within your own knowledge that there is a larger per-centage of cases of pleuro-pneumonia where those dairies exist?—Yes; from my own knowledge and from returns that I have obtained from parties in an official position, I believe that there is a much larger number of cases of pleuro-pneumonia in dairies where they get Dutch cows than there is in the other parts of the country.

8763. Do you know at all what the number of those cows kept in Edinburgh is, taking Edinburgh as one of the principal towns in which those dairies exist?—The number of licenses for stalls given out by the authorities is 1865, but the stalls are never all full. About 1,600 cows is the number, I believe, that is kept in Edinburgh within the Parliamentary bounds.

8764. Have you any returns as to other towns?—As to Leith, which adjoins Edinburgh, I have not the number licensed; but one of the magistrates gave me the number of cows, taken by counting them, at 394.

8765. Was that this year?—That was a fortnight ago.

8766. You stated, I think, that you were able to speak, from the information that you possess, as to there being a greater number of attacks of pleuro-pneumonia in those places than in the others; can you speak at all as to the number of cases that have occurred lately during any fixed period?—In the year 1875, according to the Report to the Privy Council from the Veterinary Department, there were in Edinburgh 363 cows slaughtered for being affected with pleuro-pneumonia out of the 1,600 that are kept in the town.

8767. That was in the whole year, was it?—Yes.

8768. Did that include the return for Leith?—No, not for Leith.

8769. Were there many affected in Leith?—I think there were 100 and odd in Leith.

8770. So that out of a number of nearly 2,000 cows, there were about 464 cases of pleuro-pneumonia?—Yes.

8771. Have you any facts with regard to Glasgow, where they also have these dairies?—In Glasgow, from the facts furnished by Professor McCall, there are 2,000 cows kept; and about 115 was the number of cases of pleuro-pneumonia that was compensated for by the local authority.

8772. There the number are very much less?—Very much less.

8773. Have you any way of accounting for that; do the Glasgow dairies draw their supplies equally from the foreign import?—The Glasgow dairies draw their supply from a healthy district of country, that is Lanarkshire and Argyleshire, to which there is no importation of stock.

8774. Therefore you would quote those figures as showing that in Glasgow, where they draw their supply from the inland counties, the dairies were not so severely attacked as in Leith and Edinburgh, where the foreign dairy cows are principally landed?—Precisely so.

8775. Can you give the Committee any idea of the length of time that it takes to bring the animals from Holland into Edinburgh?—Three years ago I went over to see the chemical agricultural stations in Germany, and I returned by Rotterdam. At Rotterdam there was a cow market being held, which I looked through, and in the steamer in which I sailed there were 40 or 50 cows which had been bought in that market, and which were put on board the steamer and landed in Leith within 36 hours from the time that they were put on board the steamer.

8776. Then I suppose you would represent that as pleuro-pneumonia is a disease that is very often a long time lying dormant in the animal, the inspection is not sufficient to protect you as against the introduction of pleuro-pneumonia by those cows?—Certainly; neither for foot-and-mouth disease nor for pleuro-pneumonia.

8777. Do you believe that these diseases are imported diseases, or do you consider that there is any possibility of their breaking out spontaneously in Scotland?—I do not think that they belong to this country at all, but that they are foreign diseases.

8778. To your knowledge, is there much pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease in Scotland at the present time?—I think that there is pleuro-pneumonia in the towns.

8779. But I mean generally throughout the herds of the country?—There is very little in the country, though there are cases; a case broke out in my own neighbourhood the day before I left for here. But there is no foot-and-mouth disease, and there is very little pleuro-pneumonia generally.

8780. In your opinion might these diseases be stamped out if the source of their supply which you have described, namely, the foreign import, were put a stop to?—I think so.

8781. It has been stated to the Committee by some of the witnesses, that these diseases might be induced by the treatment of the animals on board ship, and by the hardships endured during the voyage; is that your opinion?—I do not believe it.

8782. Do you form that opinion from having had considerable experience in sending animals out long distances to the colonies?—To New Zealand. We never had a case of foot-and-mouth disease in the 5,000 sheep that we sent out to New Zealand, or of any disease at all except what they carried with them, which was scab in the cargo from the mistake of a veterinary surgeon.

8783. In those countries, I believe, at the present moment they have practically stamped out the diseases?—In New South Wales, where they have had very sharp restrictions for the last 15 years, they have got entirely quit of scab, and Victoria also is now clear.

8784. I suppose that is a country in which, from the nature of the country itself, it is very difficult to carry out regulations?—Extremely so.

8785. And yet, notwithstanding that, they have stamped out the diseases?—They have stamped out scab. I believe that out of the 24,000,000 sheep in New South Wales all the flocks are reported as "clean," and so is Victoria, so long foul.

8786. Are you yourself aware what the regulations are which have brought about this result in New South Wales?—I am sorry that I have not the whole of the Acts which the New South Wales Government have passed in regard to that; but I have one here which was passed 11 years

Chairman—continued.

years ago, which, I think, is the foundation of their success in keeping out foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest.

8787. Are the regulations, as laid down in that Act, very strict?—Very strict.

8788. Wherever disease breaks out do they make it an infected district?—They first isolate the disease.

8789. They isolate the particular place in which it breaks out; do they take power for slaughtering as we do in this country?—Their regulations are different for different diseases. With regard to scab, they give the owner so many months (three months) to have his flock entirely cleared; if it is not cleared by that time he is heavily fined.

8790. But with regard to the other diseases which we have had more particularly before us, foot-and-mouth, pleuro-pneumonia, and cattle plague; as to those diseases, do they take power to slaughter in a defined area, or do they merely slaughter any animals attacked, and any animals that may have been brought in contact with them; in the one case the defined area is what was recommended by the Report of the Committee in 1873, and what is in force now on the Continent; and the other is in force now in our own country; that is to say, the slaughter of diseased animals and any other animals that may come in contact with them?—The law is, that they would slaughter the whole of them.

8791. Have the authorities power to slaughter any suspected animals, or are they limited only to slaughtering those that come in absolute contact with the disease?—They have power to slaughter suspected animals.

8792. In that respect they have the same power as they have on the Continent for dealing with those diseases?—Yes.

8793. And you say that those regulations, even in a country where it is excessively difficult to enforce them, have practically been so far successful as to stamp out the disease?—Yes.

8794. Would that lead you to imagine that we should be able to do the same in this country?—I may mention that they have not been able to stamp out pleuro-pneumonia, because pleuro-pneumonia is so difficult to deal with there. In many parts of New South Wales there are what they call scrubs, that is a sort of low brushwood, and the cattle break away and get into the low brushwood, and there they become half wild, or quite wild, and if pleuro-pneumonia gets into a mob of wild cattle, it is impossible, as it were, to stamp it out.

8795. Those are conditions which, not existing in this country, do not in the least prevent the possibility of stamping it out here?—Not in the slightest.

8796. Have you had any experience during your many voyages to those countries of the trade in dead meat?—My attention at that time was not particularly directed to it, but I have sailed in steamships between the different Australian ports where dead meat was carried on board the ships. For instance, I came down from Sidney to Melbourne, and there were the carcases of 50 cattle hung on hooks on the deck protected from the sun, and the meat kept perfectly well over the voyage.

8797. What was the length of the voyage?—Turning up my notes that I made at the time, I find that that particular voyage was 54 hours, but

Chairman—continued.

it was a very speedy one; very often 60 hours, or about 2½ days, is the time that they take for that voyage.

8798. During that time were any other precautions taken to preserve the meat except hanging it in the shade with a free circulation of air?—The passage of the steamship through the air created a current which kept the meat, and of course at sea there are no flies such as would destroy it on land.

8799. I suppose the meat was properly packed?—No; it was hung just as it would be in a butcher's shop, and that was the great beauty of it; the temperature was about 70 degrees even at sea.

8800. Notwithstanding the temperature, from the way in which they carried it, the meat was brought in a condition fit for the market after a voyage of that length?—Yes. My curiosity was attracted to it, and the last thing I did before I left the vessel was to lift the canvass and look at the meat, and it was quite fresh.

8801. In what year was this?—September 1866.

8802. At the time that you were superintending the sending out of animals to this farm?—At the time that I was engaged in passing between the different colonies superintending the valuations of runs for the company.

8803. Turning to another point upon which this Committee has had considerable evidence, that is to say, with regard to the present regulations in the country, do you think that any improvement could be made in the regulations which are now in force; for instance, in making them applicable by a central authority rather than by a local authority?—The great difficulty at present is the want of uniformity in the carrying out of the regulations.

8804. In your opinion, the regulations, to be effective, should be uniform?—Yes.

8805. Would you recommend that the regulations for dealing with these diseases should be centred in the Privy Council?—In the Privy Council.

8806. And that the regulations which are at present exercised by the local authority should be done away with, and that they should be made regulations of a central authority?—Or the local authorities ought to be made to conform to the instructions of the Privy Council.

8807. You think that the local authorities generally should work upon the regulations laid down by the Privy Council?—Yes.

8808. So that you might get uniformity throughout the different districts?—Precisely.

8809. Have you considered at all the point as to the way in which those regulations issued by the Privy Council should be enforced?—There is one suggestion which I would make with regard to that; I would take a lesson from the way in which the Inland Revenue conduct their business, and even from the way that the Education Department manages in Scotland. The Inland Revenue have general officers whom they send all over the different districts of the country, and who make visits of surprise, as do the inspectors of national schools in Scotland; if a national schoolmaster is thought not to be getting on very well, a visit of surprise is made by the inspector. I think that such an officer would be of great value in seeing that the regulations were properly carried out.

Mr. *Melvin.*

2 July 1877.

Chairman—continued.

8810. I understand you to say that you think those regulations, when once they were laid down by the Privy Council, should be enforced by the inspectors appointed by the locality, but that the Privy Council should ensure their being carried out uniformly and properly by having travelling inspectors, who should visit the localities at different unknown times, and see that they were properly worked?—Exactly so.

8811. And you do not think it would be necessary that the central authority should have the appointment of inspectors in all counties, but that they might work it, as the Inland Revenue do, by means of travelling inspectors?—I think so.

8812. Would you make any alteration in the rules with regard to dealing with pleuro-pneumonia?—I would decidedly do so.

8813. How would you propose to alter them?—I will state a case in point. A farm in my neighbourhood was recently let; it did not suit the farmer to graze his own grass, and he let his grass to different people this spring; a neighbouring farmer, who had pleuro-pneumonia in his stock, took one of those fields, and, after 30 days having elapsed, he sent his stock to this particular field; within other 30 days pleuro-pneumonia broke out again in this field seven or eight days ago, and three or four fresh cases occurred in that field; so that 30 days is much too short a time.

8814. You would increase the time in which the restrictions should operate in cases where pleuro-pneumonia developed itself?—Exactly.

8815. To what length would you extend it?—I should say that 90 days would be safe; about three months.

8816. During those three months would you restrict all movement from the infected district?—It depends upon how the district is defined. I should think, in regard to pleuro-pneumonia, it is not so very infectious as foot-and-mouth disease, and it would be more from the immediate locality.

8817. That would be more a question of limiting the area; but in a case of pleuro-pneumonia, you would not think it necessary to take so wide an area as in a case of foot-and-mouth disease; though in both cases, for whatever area was declared to be infected, you would for three months prohibit all movement; is that what I understand you to say?—Yes.

8818. Supposing the area was, on account of pleuro-pneumonia, declared to be an infected area, you think that restrictions as to movement for three months would be sufficient in that case; and probably in case of foot-and-mouth disease, which you believe to be more infectious, you would have a larger area dealt with in the same way?—Yes, but in a shorter space of time.

8819. For what space of time would you think that those regulations ought to apply, in case of foot-and-mouth disease?—I should think that they ought to be in force for one month.

8820. Would you enforce those regulations by penalties of any sort?—Yes; I would increase the present penalties considerably, for any infringement of the regulations, when they were laid down by the Privy Council.

8821. That being your view of the regulations to stamp out the disease do you, speaking as I understand you to say, as representing a very large number of the farmers of Scotland, believe that, with a view of getting rid of the diseases, they would be prepared to submit to such stringent regulations as that?—It would depend upon whether they are convinced or not that the diseases are not to be brought in. They would not submit to stringent regulations if the diseases were permitted, as it were, to be brought into the country.

Chairman—continued.

8822. I understand you, then, to say, that these regulations which you believe would stamp out the two diseases would only be submitted to by the farmers if they got along with them, a guarantee that the diseases would not be imported from abroad?—Exactly so.

8823. It is a combination of restrictions against foreign cattle, and restrictions on your own cattle, for the purpose of stamping out the disease, which you would recommend.

8824. Do you believe that there would be very much opposition, beyond the farmers, to restrictions of that sort affecting the trade of the country?—I think that the memorial that I have read from Mr. M'Lagan's county, and from the county in which I reside, is sufficient proof that the farmers are prepared to submit to any restrictions in order to get the disease stamped out; but I believe that the jobbers and dealers would make a great outcry about these restrictions.

8825. The outcry against the regulations would not come, you think, from the farmers, but from the salesmen and the other people, who would be seriously affected if markets and fairs were stopped?—Exactly so.

8826. Have you much sheep-scab at present in Scotland?—In different districts there is a little; it is spread over many different districts, but not to any serious extent.

8827. I suppose from what you have described as the power of getting rid of it in New South Wales, you would say that that ought not to be allowed in this country?—Clearly; I do not think that the regulations are sufficiently strict to get quit of it.

8828. And you think that the farmers would be prepared to see those regulations very much strengthened for the purpose?—Undoubtedly.

8829. And if they were so strengthed you believe that they would be as effective here as they have been in the colonies?—Equally so.

8830. Have you ever considered the question of the supply of meat to the population here from Australia and our other colonies?—Yes, along with our manager of the New Zealand Company; we have repeatedly discussed the matter.

8831. I suppose that there is a capacity for a very large supply from that country if you could get over the difficulty of transport?—There are barely 2,500,000 people in Australasia, including New Zealand; and at the present time there are 70,000,000 sheep and about 7,000,000 cattle, which gives a very large number of live stock for the population which exists in those colonies.

8832. Has there been any attempt beyond what we know of in the way of preserved meat being sent from there, to get over the difficulty of sending meat to this country?—There have been frequent attempts made, but none of them have been successful as yet. There was an attempt made about five years ago by Mr. Mort, of Sidney, which I believe gave rise to the dead-meat trade from America. He was able to carry the meat in a sound state on a ship for three weeks.

8833. But

Chairman—continued.

8833. But there has been no attempt to deal with it in the way that it is dealt with from America?—There is a vessel now on the voyage, I believe, called the "Northam". I heard by letter from Sidney that there was a vessel leaving Sidney in which the meat was sent at a very low temperature, at about freezing temperature, and that vessel, if not on her way, will very soon be on her way to this country to give the matter a fair trial.

8834. Although the experiment is going to be made, we have no experience of it at this moment?—No.

8835. When did the vessel start?—I am not sure of the day.

8836. I suppose if it was possible to overcome that difficulty, the price of the animal, the raw material, out there would render the trade a remunerative one?—Yes, unless the expenses connected with it are very large; because the price in the Colonies is very low.

8837. Have you any figures as to the amount of breeding cattle in Scotland?—I think that in England and Scotland we have higher and better breeds of cattle than they have anywhere else.

8838. At present we are restricted from sending them abroad on account of the diseases which exist in this country, are we not?—There are no cattle admitted into Australia at present, and it will be a very great loss if that is continued, not only to the breeders in this country, but to the herds in Australia.

8839. What you represent is, that if it ultimately appears that they can supply us with dead meat from that continent, another advantage that we shall gain will be the improvement of the breed of animals out there, if we free ourselves from disease here, and therefore are able to export our better class of animals to that country?—There will be a great return. The breeders in this country will be able to send their high class animals out there at a good price, and then the masses in this country will get beef and mutton from there at a moderate price.

8840. You will improve the quality of the animal by the English higher class beast being sent out?—Precisely.

8841. And that at present you are prevented from doing on account of the prevalence of disease in this country, and that is another reason for the farmers' anxiety to stamp out the diseases, and with that object to submit to regulations?—Quite so. I may mention that we sent out two years ago to New Zealand 32 sheep and 17 bulls and heifers. There were rumours of foot-and-mouth disease being rife in this country, and there was a doubt whether or not they would be admitted even to New Zealand. They were kept on board several days, and it was thought possible that they would have to be thrown overboard; but, however, they were allowed to be landed, and they were kept in quarantine for betwixt three and four months before they were permitted to be circulated to the different districts where they were going.

8842. That shows the very stringent regulations which exist in those Colonies as against pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease?—Yes.

Major *Allen.*

8843. I understand that the fact of this country being diseased interferes with our trade of exporting our cattle to foreign parts?—To Australia and to New Zealand it does.

Major *Allen*—continued.

8844. You do not know anything about Germany?—I do not.

8845. You say that in Glasgow the proportion of pleuro-pneumonia to the number of animals is less than in Edinburgh and in Leith, and you attributed that to the fact that they brought the animals to Glasgow from the healthy parts of Lanarkshire?—Exactly so.

8846. Do you think that from the treatment which the cows get in those sheds in the towns, they are more likely to get pleuro-pneumonia?—I think so.

8847. Would you think it a desirable thing to do away with those cow-sheds and get the people to buy their milk outside the towns?—I think it would be a harsh measure.

8848. Are you aware that it is done to a very great extent in London?—I am not aware that it is done in London; but it is done in Edinburgh and Leith by requiring better accommodation.

8849. You think that, under proper regulations, these cow-sheds in towns could be made perfectly healthy, or, at any rate, better than they are now?—Very much so.

8850. Have you ever thought whether it would be desirable to license jobbers and dealers in order that the local authority might get them, to a certain extent, under their control?—I am afraid that it would not work well in Scotland.

8851. Why?—It would put us in the hands of a class, so that we should not be able to get our cattle shifted very often when we wanted them shifted.

8852. Of course, if a farmer wanted to send his cattle to market, he would make use of his own men, and if he wanted to buy them back again, of course he would make use of his own men; but there are a certain class of dealers and jobbers in England who will buy anything and send it along a road whether it is affected with disease or not; I do not know whether that is the case in Scotland?—There are a few existing in the towns, but I do not think that that applies to the country generally.

Mr. *Arthur Peel.*

8853. Are the consumers in Scotland largely dependent upon the foreign supply at present?—I think that we produce more fat cattle than we consume, but we purchase a great many lean.

8854. You cannot give us any general idea of the extent to which they are dependent upon the foreign supply?—There are a few cattle that come from abroad, some from Spain, some from Holland, and some fairish cattle occasionally from Denmark; but, as a rule, they are an inferior class of cattle that come to Scotland.

8855. Of course, when you with your experience say that you would have all the foreign cattle slaughtered at the port, you have contemplated what the effect of that would be upon the price to the consumer, and its effect generally upon the markets of Scotland; what effect would it have?—The effect would be this: that we should breed more cattle, and we should keep better cattle, and we should keep our cattle longer, if these diseases did not come in to frighten us.

8856. But do you not think that the obligation of killing at the port would have the effect

Mr. *Melvin.*

2 July 1877.

Mr. *Arthur Peel*—continued.

of diminishing the number of cattle imported?—It might for a time, but I think it would be easily got over; I think it would arrange itself.

8857. And you would not be satisfied with any amount of quarantine?—I think that quarantine is utterly impossible. You get in half-a-dozen shipments of cattle; one animal is infected with foot-and-mouth disease, and the whole are infected, and the quarantine, except for a very few animals in separate divisions, would be an utter impossibility.

8858. Is it the case that any animals come into Scotland from abroad for store purposes except the milch cows?—Not now. I used to have Dutch heifers and Dutch cows, and some from Holstein to fatten, but we do not get them now; they do not send them.

8859. I suppose the conditions of a town are unfavourable to the health of an animal?—Not necessarily.

8860. At all events, the conditions of dairy life in towns are practically unhealthy, are they not?—They are so, from the number of diseases to which the animals are exposed.

8861. Does not the fact that pleuro-pneumonia is now existing in towns in Scotland, whilst the country is almost entirely free from it, point rather in this direction: that the towns, at all events, facilitate the production of disease, if they do not originate disease?—If you bring Dutch cows into Leith and let those Dutch cows pass the dairy doors, then they are exposed to catch the infection.

8862. But the town cows go into the country do they not?—The town cows do not go into the country; they are generally kept either indoors all the year round, or they are in little fields around the town. But those 1,600 that I alluded to just now in Edinburgh are almost entirely within the Parliamentary bounds, and they are very seldom out of their dairies.

8863. Do you think that the Edinburgh dairies could be supplied with cows in the same way as the Glasgow dairies are now supplied?—I think so.

Colonel *Kingscote.*

8864. I understand you to express a very strong opinion that if the country was freed from pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease, putting aside rinderpest, a very much larger number of cattle would be bred by agriculturists generally in Great Britain; is that your opinion?—I think so; I think that in our district we have facts enough to show that.

8865. With regard to Australia, you have given evidence that no stock can be imported into Australia at all. I hold in my hand a letter which I received this morning from a brother of mine who is farming in New South Wales, dated the 9th of May, in which he says that an effort is made to get the legislature out there to change the law, and to propose that any cattle being exported from this country should first of all be inspected by a highly qualified veterinary surgeon in England before they are shipped, and each shipper to pay 50 *l.* to defray the expenses of quarantine on arriving there,

8865*. Do you think that the demand in the colonies for our best pedigree cattle is so great that even with those restrictions they would come and purchase them?—I think they would. I hold in my hand an account of the cost of those cattle that we sent to New Zealand two years ago; it amounts in all to some 4,400 *l.* for 32 sheep and 17 head of cattle.

Colonel *Kingscote*—continued.

8866. Even with the high freightage and everything they are very willing to get our animals?—I think so.

8867. I know it of my own experience, but I ask you from what you know whether that is so?—I believe it to be the fact.

Mr. *Norwood.*

8868. Did I correctly understand you to state that you would make no exception in regard to the circulation of foreign cattle after they are imported?—There are cattle from Spain, but I am afraid that foot-and-mouth disease has come from Spain.

8869. Have you any knowledge of that yourself?—No because no cattle come into Leith; I have not seen it.

8870. Have you heard anything about the condition of the American cattle that have been landed this spring?—I know it is said that pleuro-pneumonia existed in one cargo that came into Southampton; I was informed so.

8871. Then you would not allow them to circulate?—No.

8872. Would you make any exception in favour of Denmark, or of Norway, and Sweden?—I think our only safety is to have slaughter at the port.

8873. And that is really the remedy which you, on behalf of the Scottish farmers, ask?—Yes.

8874. And you would be satisfied with that?—I think quite satisfied.

8875. You would not think it necessary to limit the introduction of live foreign cattle, provided that they are slaughtered on landing?—I should not, provided that there were proper regulations and conditions to prevent the spread of disease from the places where slaughtered.

Mr. *French.*

8876. Do you think it would be possible to do away with cow-sheds altogether in the large cities?—I think that it would be harsh to do so, and I think it would be a difficult matter to do so.

8877. You have heard, I suppose, that the milk of the Aylesbury Dairy Company which was mentioned here the other day, is much better than the milk from the cows that are fed in the sheds during the summer time?—That would depend upon the food upon which the cows are fed.

8878. As a rule, in the sheds, I believe, they are fed chiefly on artificial food and roots; is not that so?—Of course cows in towns are generally fed on distillery offal or brewers' grains.

Mr. *Elliot.*

8879. You said, that some of your store stock came from Denmark, did you not?—Yes, the dairy cows of inferior quality come from Denmark.

8880. Have you ever known cases of pleuro-pneumonia come from there?—I do not exactly know any case of pleuro-pneumonia, but I know that those cows are extremely susceptible of pleuro-pneumonia if they are exposed to contagion.

8881. That

Mr. *Elliot*—continued.

8881. That is when they are put into the dairies in towns?—Yes.

8882. You say that there is a great deal of pleuro-pneumonia in the towns, and you say that it would be harsh to compel the dairies to be placed outside the towns, and that the only remedy that you can suggest is stopping the importation of milch cows and isolation?—Yes.

8883. And therefore you would use nothing but Scotch bred cows in that case?—We get a great many English bred cows from Yorkshire and the northern parts of England.

8884. But would not stopping the importation have the effect of raising the price of cows and therefore of raising the price of milk?—The effect of it would be this: there are a great many well-bred cattle that are fattened in place of being kept as milch cows; heifers are fattened in place of being kept as milch cows; and the consequence is, that the really valuable animals are cleared out of the country sooner than they would be if there were a greater inducement to keep them.

8885. But they go for meat instead?—They would go for meat eventually, after they were done with for milking purposes.

8886. But they go to meat now, instead of going as milch cows?—Undoubtedly.

Mr. *M'Lagan.*

8887. Though you are not a dairy farmer yourself, I believe you live in the vicinity of a dairy district?—Yes, I live on the edge of a dairy district.

8888. And therefore you are aware of the changes which are taking place in the management of cows in that dairy district?—Yes.

8889. I daresay, in casting your thoughts back, you may remember that on all the dairy farms there the farmers used to breed a number of cattle both to supply their own dairies and to sell also at the fairs?—Yes.

8890. Are you aware whether that is the case now or not?—It is very much given up. For instance, my father had a dairy of 40 cows, and he bred 20 calves every year. My brother, who farms the same farm, buys all his cattle now. The risk of disease is so great that it prevents their continuing the same practice.

8891. But he is feeding cattle but not cows?—Not cows.

8892. Are you aware of any farmers in your neighbourhood who buy cows every year, use them for dairy purposes, fatten them off, and sell them every year?—That is now the general system.

8893. And you could easily fancy that the effect of that would be to reduce the number of cattle in the country?—Very much so.

8894. Can you give the Committee any reason for the farmers adopting that system?—It is simply that it pays better, because there is less risk.

8895. They are afraid of pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease?—Yes, and especially of foot-and-mouth disease.

8896. Is it not the fact that in some districts in Scotland each farm labourer formerly had a cow?—In some districts it is the case still, and it was the case in more districts formerly than it is now.

8897. But there are not so many cows kept by farm labourers?—There is a considerably less number kept.

Mr. *M'Lagan*—continued.

8898. I daresay you have heard that the cause of there not being so many kept is the great losses which the labourers suffered from the cattle dying from pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease?—Yes; the effect was that many of their societies became bankrupt.

8899. And therefore the effect of importing pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease into this country has been to compel the farm labourers to purchase milk, whereas they had it before from their own cows?—Exactly so.

8900. In those districts where the farm labourers kept cows, were not the men a great deal better in health and in stamina than they are now when they have not the advantage of that milk?—That is certainly so.

8901. So that the stamina of our labouring farm population is actually suffering from the importation of these diseases from abroad?—In many districts there is very little milk used now amongst our ploughmen and hinds.

8902. What do they use?—Tea is coming much more into use.

8903. And that certainly is not so conducive to the strength of the labourers as good porridge and milk?—Certainly not.

8904. The views that you have been advocating one would suppose to be rather those of a Protectionist, but I understand that you have been a great Free Trader all your life, and if I remember rightly, you were one of the few farmers that advocated the repeal of the Corn Laws; how can you reconcile your views at the present time with your free trade principles?—I hold that there should be no free trade in disease.

8905. And therefore you want to have the importation of good sound cattle; but you are afraid that it would be no free trade in cattle, but only free trade in disease, if you allowed the importation of live stock?—Clearly so.

Mr. *Wilbraham Egerton.*

8906. Are you aware whether condensed milk is ever used in the towns or by the agricultural labourers in Scotland?—Not at all; I have got it on board ship, but I have not seen it in the country to any extent; it is too costly.

8907. Are there any factories in Scotland for making it?—There are not in the Lothians, and I am not aware of any in Scotland.

8908. Is your objection to Dutch cows that they are so liable to pleuro-pneumonia, or is it also because they are also so liable to foot-and-mouth disease?—Both; I have no objection to Dutch cows as Dutch cows; they are good and useful animals, far better than the Danish cows; but it is to the risk that is attached of their bringing disease with them that I object.

8909. Supposing that the Dutch were to stamp out pleuro-pneumonia, and that you could have a clean bill of health from Holland as far as pleuro-pneumonia is concerned, would you be satisfied to take animals for dairy purposes from Holland, with some guarantee against foot-and-mouth disease, such as a short quarantine, either in this country or on the other side, provided that the Dutch Government could give you that assurance?—I believe that the thing is impossible, for this reason: that the ramifications of the railways on the Continent are so minute, that cows an-

Mr. *Melvin.*

2 *July* 1877.

Mr. *Melvin.*

2 July 1877.

Mr. *Wilbraham Eyerton*—continued.

and cattle may be brought from de'il knows where; so that we have no guarantee whatever.

8910. Your impression is, that there is no guarantee on the part of Holland lest animals should be imported from beyond their own border; is that your argument?—Exactly so.

8911. Is there any separation of the fat and store animals in the markets at Edinburgh?—No, all are in the same market; milch cows, fat cattle, and lean stock.

8912. Do you think it would be desirable to separate the stock intended for slaughter from those intended for dairy or store purposes?—In the meantime, we are largely dependent upon England and Ireland for our fattening stock and for store stock; much of the Lowlands of Scotland are dependent upon those two places; and we attribute part of the disease that we have had to the animals coming in contact in the market.

8913. What guarantee do you suggest, or what precautions would you take, to prevent the store animals that you buy from Ireland being affected with foot-and-mouth disease?—I think that the same laws ought to apply to England, Ireland, and Scotland; I think that there ought to be uniformity of regulations for all the three countries, and that the route by which the cattle are brought from Ireland ought to be away from the towns, and that they should not be allowed to approach the towns. For instance, the cattle coming from Belfast or from Dublin should not be allowed to touch at Glasgow, but they should be landed at the ports and brought by rail away from the towns.

8914. Then you would object to their being exposed in a number of markets successively, as they constantly are?—Not in lean stock markets.

8915. You would object to their being exposed in markets where they might come in contact with other animals which were diseased, and which were destined for immediate slaughter?—Yes.

8916. Then you are of opinion that it is desirable to separate lean stock and fat stock in the markets?—If our country was clear of disease it would not be necessary, but in the meantime it is.

Mr. *W. E. Forster.*

8917. You have a good deal of store stock from the Highlands, I suppose?—We had, but the deer forests have shut up a good many of them. I used to fatten Highland cattle from the different glens, but I do not do so at all now.

8918. Therefore you would not think it necessary to make the same restriction with regard to Highland cattle, that they should not come through the towns?—There are very few so exposed now. Disease does not come from the north, as a rule; it comes from the south and east.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

8919. Do you think it would be necessary to keep up the restriction with regard to Irish cattle, that they should not go through the large towns?—It is only a view of my own. It would be for the benefit of the Irish dealers themselves, because we would give them a better price for their cattle if we had confidence that they were kept from catching infection by the way.

Chairman.

8920. You stated that in Glasgow the dairies were principally supplied from Lanarkshire and other districts in Scotland, whilst in Leith and in Edinburgh they come principally from Holland; can you give the comparative prices as between the Dutch cows and the Lanarkshire cows?—Three descriptions of cows come to Edinburgh. There are the Yorkshire cows and the cows from the north of England, which, perhaps, bring from 25*l.* to 30*l.*; then the Dutch cows bring about 25*l.*; but the Danish cows bring from 8*l.* to 12*l.*; then the Scotch cows, the Ayrshire cows, perhaps fetch from 15*l.* to 25*l.*; they vary more.

8921. Therefore the dairies can be supplied at as cheap a rate from the home breed as from the Dutch breed, whilst the Danish cow is a cheaper animal altogether?—Yes.

8922. Are there many cows imported from Denmark?—A good many.

8923. You stated, did you not, that you thought that the breed of cows in the country would very much increase if confidence were given by these instructions being enforced, and that you could, therefore, count on a much larger supply for dairy purposes for home stock?—I think that would be the effect.

8924. Do you think that the demand for them would overcome the demand which at present exists for heifers for fattening off?—I think that there would be more left for milk.

8925. I suppose, as a practical farmer, you would say that a heifer fattens off and goes off a farm into the market more quickly than a bullock does?—Certainly.

8926. Farmers are very fond (at least, they are in the south; I do not know whether they are in the north) of fattening heifers quickly for the market, are they not?—We cannot get them as a rule, because you pay a better price for them than we are inclined to pay.

8927. But there would be competition amongst farmers who wanted to fatten, increasing the number of breeding cows?—Exactly.

Mr. Thomas Rudkin, called in; and Examined.

Mr. *Rudkin.*

Chairman.

8928. I believe you are a member of the Common Council of the City of London?—I am.

8929. And you are Chairman of the City Lands Committee?—That is so.

8930. And you have been also a member, for some years, of the Markets Committee?—For nearly 20 years.

8931. With regard to the market at Deptford, with which the City have been recently connected, can you give the number of animals that have

Chairman—continued.

come into that market, comparing last year and this year?—I can. According to the return for the first six months of this year, there have been 6,734 cattle, 6,717 calves, 328,575 sheep, and 774 pigs.

8932. Can you compare that with the quantity that came in the same period of the year before?—I have not the figures added up for the year; the numbers are not picked out so as to enable me to give you the comparative numbers.

8933. Do

Chairman—continued.

8933. Do the figures show an increase or a decrease?—The cattle have considerably fallen off in numbers, and the sheep have enormously increased in numbers. That is owing, of course, to the restrictions which have been placed upon the import from Germany; the cattle have dropped off from Germany, and the sheep have been free from Germany. Last year they went to the cattle market, and this year they have been compelled to go to Deptford.

8934. And that accounts for the great variation which has taken place in those stocks?—Quite so

8935. The prohibition of the German cattle has made the difference in the Deptford Market?—Yes.

8936. Can you give any comparison of figures with regard to the Metropolitan Market?—Yes. At the cattle market at Islington for the same period, viz., for the first six months of the year, there were 23,620 foreign beasts, and 39,390 foreign sheep; but for 1876 there were 31,620 foreign cattle, and 343,690 foreign sheep.

8937. In that case the sheep had all gone into that market?—Yes. The tendency has been to a considerable falling off in the numbers since 1865 of English cattle and sheep into London, and a considerable increase of foreign cattle and sheep.

8938. That is to say, into the Metropolitan Market?—Not only to the Metropolitan Market, but you must include also Deptford, taking the two markets together as representing the supply into London.

8939. But the Deptford Market would not take the home supply?—No, the cattle market takes the home supply.

8940. In the Metropolitan Market, as I understand you, the English supply has steadily fallen off since 1865?—Yes.

8941. And it has been met by an increase of the foreign supply both at Deptford and in the Metropolitan Market?—Quite so.

8942. Can you tell the Committee what the condition of the Deptford Market is from a sanitary point of view?—I say that it is in a very excellent condition, in a sanitary point of view.

8943. We have heard one witness who has described it to the Committee in very strong terms; have you read the evidence?—I have read the evidence that has been given. As a matter of fact, manure is there, and it must necessarily remain for a considerable period, owing to the fact that it has to be thoroughly disinfected; but the manure is all taken away, subject to the Order of the Privy Council; and there is a certificate given with it before it is permitted to leave. There is no more manure there than would be accumulated at any market under existing circumstances.

8944. And anything that is described as offensive rises from that, if from any cause?—The stench arising from the carbolic acid that is used is really a great deal worse than the stench from the manure itself. I think we ought to discover something better than carbolic acid, which positively poisons the atmosphere, it makes it so bad that people cannot remain.

8945. Do you mean that it is bad from a sanitary point of view, or that it is merely disagreeable?—It has a disagreeable smell.

8946. And therefore when a gentleman spoke of the effluvium, and of his dislike to remain in the market, it may be accounted for by that?—It is certanly very unpleasant; I must admit that.

8947. I suppose you are able to speak officially as to the records of the cargoes that were landed with disease in the present year?—I have it here. I suppose that the Privy Council have had it also; but I can hand it in now. This is the official record of the destruction of those 39 animals.

8948. They remained on the wharf for some time before they were slaughtered, did they not?—They remained for no longer than was absolutely necessary. Perhaps it would be as well to explain the process. Under the Order in Council, it is necessary that a part of the market should be declared an infected place if cattle plague or other disease exists there. So soon as it is declared an infected place, of course nothing is permitted to leave or to enter it, certainly no person is allowed to leave it without being thoroughly disinfected. There is a digester in each of the compartments of the market; there being four compartments, there are four digesters; and in each of those four compartments the digester is sufficiently capacious to boil down or steam at one process eight carcases if they are cut up; but if they are placed in the digester whole, it would not contain more than some three, or from that to four animals at the utmost. The number that had to be destroyed of course taxed the capability of this one digester very much.

8949. I understand that only one was able to be used, because only that part of the market was described as infected?—Yes; if we had used either of the other digesters we should also have had to declare the other section of the market an infected place; and if we had done as was suggested by some practical gentlemen, that is to say, used the whole of them to destroy the carcases we should have had, under the Order in Council, the whole of the Deptford Market declared an infected place. Therefore we did the best we could, under the circumstances, to get rid of them as speedily as possible.

8950. Have the corporation considered the advisability of getting rid of them in case of an outbreak of that sort, where such difficulties arise as you describe, by any other process, such as the burial of them, as they do abroad?—It would be utterly impossible to bury them in a section of the market. If we had two or three outbreaks we should have the whole of the foundations of the market absolutely undermined. If we were to extend our sections we should have space outside the market that we might bury them in.

8951. There is a large open space there which might be used for that purpose, is there not, if it was thought advisable?—Quite so.

8952. But, up to the present time, it has been considered that those "digesters," as you call them, are sufficient for any outbreak that might arise?—It was found so before, but those 39 animals certainly taxed our powers to the utmost.

8953. And in consequence of that, for some days after they were attacked with the disease, they had to remain before they could be got rid of?—I think they had to remain for four days.

8954. I suppose that during that time every precaution was taken to prevent the spread of the

Mr. *Rudkin.*

2 July 1877.

Chairman—continued.

the disease from that section?—Yes, every precaution.

8955. With regard to the present system of regulations made by the Privy Council and the local authorities, do you consider that those are satisfactory?—I do not, most certainly. I believe that the great detriment to the trade, and certainly to the corporation, and I humbly submit to the interests of the public, is the fact that we never know which way to move; we never know from one day to another what regulations will be in force.

8956. I understand you to say that you consider that in the interests of the public and for the benefit of the corporation and of the trade, permanent regulations should be laid down guiding this market?—Certainly.

8957. You think that the present sudden changes very much destroy the utility of the market itself?—Yes, I think so.

8958. Is it your view, then, that animals coming from abroad should be slaughtered at the port?—Yes, I think so; I do not see any way out of it except that I regret to be compelled to give that opinion, but I am afraid that there is only one way to deal with it, and that is to slaughter everything that comes from abroad at the place of landing.

8959. You think that, in fact, all foreign countries should be treated as scheduled countries, and that animals from those countries should be landed at certain defined ports in England where they should be slaughtered?—Yes, I think so; and I do not think that under those circumstances there would be any real detriment either to the trade or to the consignor.

8960. It has been stated that the consignor of the animals was really prejudiced by having his animal killed at the port of debarkation, and that the result would be loss to the consumer from the fact of the trade flowing in another direction; but I understand you to represent that you believe that the certainty which would be procured by slaughtering all animals at the port, at Deptford, for instance, would bring a sufficient trade to attract the foreign cattle?—Certainly. I have read the evidence that has been given with reference to that question, and I have no hesitation in saying that the statements made cannot be borne out by the facts of the case. For instance, if there were, as Mr. Gebhardt states, from 2*l.* to 3*l.* per head difference in the price of an animal being sent to Deptford less than it would fetch if it was sent to the cattle market, I say that instead of their having a dozen buyers or 20 buyers down there they would have have 500 buyers. If the wholesale trade, the carcase butchers, were aware of the fact that there was a difference of 3*l.* per head profit to them in buying the animals at Deptford instead of buying them in the cattle market at Islington, there would be no lack of competition at Deptford.

8961. What, I suppose, Mr. Gebhardt meant was this: that under the present uncertain supply at the Deptford Market, the trade was not attracted there; that the trade was in the hands of a very few men, and therefore the prices were readily regulated by them?—I do not think that that it so. I know as a fact that they are the keenest buyers alive, and that men go there who can pay ready money, and they have to stand on one side for a man who has to take credit; and that is the proof that the salesman stands out for his price, and there is no monopoly at all in the question.

Chairman—continued.

8962. You do not think that the evidence that we have had upon that point is borne out by the facts?—Certainly not; I know to the contrary.

8963. Do you say that an additional guarantee to the sender would be given if the uncertainty which is represented to be so prejudicial was done away with?—Yes. The value of the animal at Deptford may be rather less than what it would fetch at the cattle market, but the difference is very small indeed; I do not believe that the difference in the expenses of sending the cattle to the cattle market rather than sending the cattle to Deptford.

8964. You mean that the tolls at Islington are heavy?—Quite so. The charges and expenses on an animal, if it goes to the Copenhagen Cattle Market, are so much, and if it goes to Deptford they are so much; I believe that the difference in favour of Deptford would make up for the difference of price at Deptford.

8965. Could you give the difference in prices?—It was given in evidence in 1873.

8966. And you believe that that difference would really cover the loss which is supposed to exist upon the foreign animal at Deptford?—I think so.

8967. Whilst buyers would be attracted in larger number from the greater supply?—I think so. It would give us stability, and we should have plenty of competition at once.

8968. During certain times of the year, if a large number of animals were thrown upon the Depford Market, where they must be slaughtered, could that supply of meat be carried through the country; and would not that rather injure the Deptford Market, and prevent animals coming there on account of the possibility of the meat not being circulated as freely as other animals can be?—To a certain extent that would be so; but what one has to consider is the desirability of preventing the spread of disease. There is no doubt that all these restrictions must, to a certain extent, militate against the power of getting meat about the country; but at the same time I believe it will be an immense boon to the public if we establish a dead-meat supply. The nearer the animals are slaughtered to where they are fed the better it must be for the community at large.

8969. You mean that the animal is not so much deteriorated?—Certainly; I have no hesitation in saying, that if all the animals that are slaughtered in London could be slaughtered near where they are fed, it would be a saving of at least 5 per cent. of the meat supply.

8970. Do you mean in the quality and condition of the beasts?—In absolute weight of meat, and immensely in quality. I may state this as a fact, that so much do the trade appreciate the country-killed meat, that in providing their dinner for Sunday (I am speaking of the men in the meat market) they universally pick out a bit of meat that has been slaughtered in the country, and they seldom or never touch a bit of meat that has been slaughtered in London.

8971. And, therefore, the nearer you slaughter to the place where the animal is bred the greater the amount of food, in your opinion, that you would get for the consumption of the people?—Certainly.

8972. Are you able to speak at all of the period

Chairman—continued.

period in which the cattle were slaughtered at Deptford at the time of the outbreak of the cattle plague?—Yes.

8973. At that time was there a large supply of dead-meat sent from Deptford into the country?—Yes, and a large quantity goes into the country now. Thousands of sheep are slaughtered at Deptford, and pass away to all parts of the country now.

8974. They go away to Wales by the Great Western Railway, as Sir Alexander Wood told us?—Yes, and the hind quarters come back again, and they are sold in London as Welsh mutton.

8975. In fact they perform two journeys, and after all they find their best market in London?—Yes. The possibility of fresh meat travelling is exemplified by the fact that sheep are slaughtered at Deptford, sent to Cardiff, the hind quarters there cut off, and sent to Landon again and sold as Welsh mutton, and then possibly they are sent into the country again to be consumed.

8976. I gather, then, from that experience of yours, that there is not the difficulty which, as has been described, in supplying some of our large manufacturing towns with sheep from Deptford if slaughtered there?—The only point is the question of the offals; that is the point that all the butchers make, and there is something in it so far as the offal question is concerned. But I believe that sufficient attention has not been directed to that question; what we want to do is to establish at the cattle market at Islington, and at Deptford as well, something similar to what there is in the abattoirs in Paris; you want a *triperie*, in point of fact, and the offals should be dressed there as well as they are in Paris; and then, instead of their being, as they now are, in a filthy state, they would be very beautiful food for the poor, and certainly for the rich man's table as well.

8977. In fact, there is no difficulty in dealing with the offal; it is only that a sufficient amount of trouble is not bestowed upon it?—The trade do not seem to me to have paid any attention to it at all; they slaughter the animals, and they get men to contract to take the offals away, and they let them go, and do not take any trouble with them.

8978. Are you able to speak from your own knowledge of the fact which has been stated by other witnesses, that the offal at the present moment is packed any how in carts and sent away from Deptford for marketing in other parts of the town, and that it goes through this journey and yet comes out uninjured?—The manner in which the offals are treated is not creditable to us in any shape or form.

8979. But there is not the difficulty which has been represented in dealing with the dead-meat trade as regards the offal?—I think not. I should like a deputation of the butchers to go over to Paris to see how it is done, and I think they would come back still more intelligent than they are.

8980. Prejudices might still reign supreme?—Possibly so.

8981. I understood you to say that in your opinion the public would be benefited by animals from abroad being treated as from scheduled countries and slaughtered at the port?—I think so, always taking, of course, the point of view that it is desirable to stop the spread of disease.

Chairman—continued.

8982. And from that point of view, I suppose you would say that from any country where cattle plague existed, you would prohibit the import altogether for the time, at all events?—Certainly.

8983. With regard to the Metropolitan Cattle Market, should the conditions of that market in any way alter your opinion?—Not from what they are now; I think that the cordon should be kept up, and it should be a market for fat stock.

8984. But you would not, under those circumstances, I suppose, allow store animals to be brought there?—No, certainly not; it never ought to have been permitted at all.

8985. Would you go so far as to say that the animals should not be allowed to leave the metropolitan district after they have once entered it?—I think that there is more danger in animals leaving the Metropolitan Cattle Market alive than there is in their leaving the Deptford Market alive. I believe that there is more disease amongst the English cattle that go to the cattle market than there is amongst the animals that go to Deptford. I am a farmer in the country, and I would not, under any circumstances, have an animal on my farm from the Copenhagen Cattle Market.

8986. That, I understand you to say, is from the fact that you believe that market to be infected with pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease?—I am afraid that it is charged with disease.

8987. But do you mean that it is charged with those two diseases, or with more?—I think with more. You can hardly tell what disease there is there; in fact, the animals are seldom or never well after you have had them a few days from the cattle market.

8988. The lairs are so infected, that animals that coming into it are almost sure to go out of it suffering from disease?—I am afraid that that is so.

8989. For that reason, you would recommend that that cattle market should always be treated as a cattle market for slaughter, and that no animals should leave it alive?—Quite so.

8990. Have you read Mr. Gebhardt's evidence?—I have.

8991. He suggested that, whilst dealing with it as a fat stock market, and allowing no animals to be taken from it for sale in any other market, he would permit of the animal being sent to other towns marked for slaughter alone; have you considered that?—I have. I know quite sufficient of the trade of jobbers, especially, and of butchers also, to know that it would not be confined to that. If you could insure it, there would be possibly not much danger, but how are you to guard against animals being placed in a railway truck and going from the cattle market, and against the same truck being used for the conveyance of store animals? There is no doubt that foot-and-mouth disease is a very dreadful disease, and that it is spread throughout the country by the transit of animals; and, therefore, there is no doubt that you would spread foot-and-mouth disease all about the country by the conveyance of those animals by railway.

8992. For these reasons, you are strengthened in your belief that those animals should never leave the market alive?—I see no necessity for it at all. The consumers in other parts of the

Mr. *Rudkin.*

2 July 1877.

Chairman—continued.

country would have the advantage of eating English meat; they could establish markets where they thought fit, and provide themselves with that meat.

8993. Under those circumstances, there would not seem to be so much reason for keeping up the distinction as between Deptford and Islington, if both were to be treated as slaughter markets?—I hardly know that I am justified in saying so, but my own individual opinion is, that in 10 years, you will only want one market for London.

8994. But assuming that your suggestion was carried out, and that it was made purely a slaughter market, every animal coming into it being of necessity killed, do you think that one market would be sufficient for the trade?—I think so; I always held that opinion, and I still hold it.

8995. Has your attention been directed to the cow-sheds of London?—Yes. Of course we who have had to do with this question of cattle plague know that we got it from the cow-sheds of London originally: I suppose it was imported from abroad, but still it got into the cow-sheds, and we could not eradicate it at all. In the early period of 1865-6-7, the cow-sheds were the great difficulties. As you have had it in evidence before, there is not more than 15 per cent. of the milk that is consumed in London that is supplied by the London cow-sheds; and I cannot see why we cannot get that 15 per cent. from the country. I may state as a fact that I myself could not get my milk as I wanted it, and I have established a dairy in the country, and I get very much better milk at half the price that I could get it for in London; and I have never the slightest difficulty in getting it perfectly sweet and fresh, and the same with regard to my cream.

8996. You see no difficulty in a trade being established outside the London district, whilst the cow-sheds as at present existing are, from our past knowledge, liable to attacks of these diseases?—If you take the cordon off you must certainly close the London cow-sheds; but if you keep the cordon on then possibly you might in the suburban districts, just outside London, where there is some grass land, permit some cow-sheds. I may say that I have never had any trouble with my cows at all for eight or nine years, but I am particularly careful where I get them from, and I quarantine them when they come on to the farm.

8997. Where is you farm?—Near Leatherhead in Surrey.

8998. What quarantine do you make them undergo?—I place them in a field by themselves for at least three weeks.

8999. Do you think that three weeks is a sufficient length of time to quarantine them for?—Yes, I have found that sufficient; I may say that I have never had pleuro-pneumonia or foot-and-mouth disease at all, but I feed my cows in the winter exactly the same as the London cow-sheds people do; I have distillery grains down, and feed them on them and oil-cake, and roots, and chaff; but in summer I turn them out to grass, and I believe that that is what they require. They want to be resuscitated; to be pulled round, as you might say.

9000. They want to live a natural life for some part of the year?—Quite so.

9001. You would do away with London cow-sheds; but would you subject even those that you

Chairman—continued.

allowed to remain in the neighbourhood of London to any inspection, or would you leave them as they are now?—I think that there should be a thorough inspection of cow-sheds throughout the country, whether they be in London or elsewhere in the agricultural districts.

9002. Do you mean that they should be inspected by the local authorities, or by the Privy Council?—By the local authorities.

9003. I suppose you have not considered the question of the alteration in our regulations as between the powers of the local authority and the central authority?—I think that it would be very much preferable if the Privy Council were the local authorities for the metropolis altogether. Let the Privy Council take the entire management of the Orders in their own hands for the metropolis. I would get rid of the Metropolitan Board of Works jurisdiction, and of the City jurisdiction, and take it entirely into your own hands.

9004. You think that you would thereby get uniformity of action, which would be more likely to lead to the extinction of disease?—Yes; I am quite sure that in the City we should not have the slightest objection to that.

9005. You think that the City would not be so jealous of its privileges upon that point?—Not at all.

9006. I suppose that your attention has been directed very much to this new American meat supply which has come in during the last year or so?—Yes.

9007. Can you speak as to the quantity of it, and the state in which it has come here?—I know nothing of the quantities, but I can speak as to the state in which it arrives; in many instances it is very beautiful. Last Monday I think I saw the finest beef from America that I ever saw in my life from anywhere, and it realized rather over 7 *d.* per pound.

9008. Did that come direct to London?—No, it came to Liverpool.

9009. How long had it been landed before it came up?—I am not aware.

9010. But it had made the journey from Liverpool out of the atmosphere in which it had been brought over in the ship?—Quite so.

9011. It arrived, you say, in very good condition, and realized a good price?—Yes, certainly.

9012. I suppose that you have also seen a good deal which has not been equally satisfactory?—Yes, we have had a great quantity seized in the City. I am authorized by the medical officer of health for the city, Dr. Saunders, to hand in a return of the quantity of American meat that has been seized since the 1st of January of this year.

9013. What is the total amount?—Forty-nine tons 6 cwt. 1 qr. 15 lbs.

9014. What is the entire weight of meat that has been condemned?—The entire weight of meat that has been condemned by the City authorities in the same period, including those 49 tons 6 cwt. 1 qr. 15 lbs, was 106 tons 14 cwt. 3 qrs. 5 lbs.

9015. That would leave about 57 tons as the amount of condemned meat of the other supply?—Yes, about 47 per cent. of the condemned meat has been American meat.

9016. Have you been able to trace the cause of that at all?—I apprehend that it arises in consequence of the imperfect manner in which it is packed.

9017. It

Chairman—continued.

9017. It arises, you think, more from the trade not having settled down into an accomplished fact than from other causes?—I believe myself it arises from the fact (of course this is only an opinion) that the animals have to travel such a long distance before they are slaughtered in America; I believe that if there is not sufficient time, say at least a week, allowed for the animals to cool down, and get free from the fever that is caused by travelling, it is utterly impossible to bring the meat sweet.

9018. Would that, in your opinion, be a difficult matter to get over?—I do not think it would; I think that experience will enable them to get over it, because they will establish lairs and proper places to keep the cattle in so as to give them sufficient time to cool down.

9019. You think that when the trade is an ascertained certainty, and is established, they will, for their own sakes, and in order to keep up the price, take all those precautions which are necessary for sending the meat over in good condition?—I know a gentleman in America who exports meat, and he had lost considerably over two or three cargoes, and at last he almost felt that he would give it up; but a personal friend asked him under such circumstances to lend him his box on board one of the vessels, and this gentleman went over to America and used his own means to fill the box; he did so, and he sent it over here, and the only cargo he sent realized 7 *d.* per lb., and he cleared 2,000 *l.* profit out of it.

9020. So that, if it were properly attended to, it is perfectly feasible to bring meat over in good condition?—The American who lent him the box said it was "like his luck."

9021. The "luck" was the consequence of certain precautions which had been taken?—Yes, quite so. The meat is not fairly attended to here. Looking at the manner in which it is brought by railway vans and thrown about, and allowed to stand in the street for a considerable time with the sun pouring on to it, it would be perfectly wonderful if it did not stink.

9022. You do not think that the condition in which this meat has very often come over to the London markets, and in which it is condemned, is at all a condition which applies to the trade if properly conducted?—I believe that we shall have large quantities of American meat in beautiful condition, and certainly the meat is as fine as one could wish to eat. I have had a considerable quantity of it myself, and in answer to some evidence given by one of the witnesses, who states that the American meat will not take salt, I may say that as a matter of fact that is not so. I have taken down, for my farm labourers, a hind quarter of American beef, and cut it out to them at the price that I have given for it, and what I have had left I have put into the salt tub, and a fortnight or three weeks afterwards the beef has come out perfectly fresh, and has taken salt perfectly.

9023. That is an experience which entirely contradicts what has been stated here?—Quite so.

9024. You also endorse, I suppose, what one gentleman told us, namely, that the American meat is capable of being supplied largely to London customers without their making complaints as to its quality or condition. A butcher gave evidence here that he believed that a large

Chairman—continued.

portion of the trade was supplying American beef for English meat, "without any questions being asked," as he said?—Certainly; we have all of us been eating American beef, and fancying that it has been Aberdeen beef.

9025. Supposing that the conditions of the trade become satisfactory, and that this meat is brought over in good condition, that will affect very much the history of our London supplies, I suppose?—Quite so. Mr. Gebhardt stated that if the American beef were to come over in large quantities, it would have the effect of stopping the supplies of live animals from Germany and from abroad. It does occur to me that that would be an immense boon, not only to this country but to the whole of Europe, because it must have the effect of reducing the price of meat generally in Europe.

9026. And if you could get a large supply on the market, the consumers would clearly be benefited?—Certainly. In reading the evidence through very carefully, it has struck me as a curious thing that all the witnesses that have been called have simply looked at their own personal view of the question, and no witness has yet been called who has taken the public interest into consideration.

9027. That is rather human, is it not?—No doubt

9028. Although it might stop a certain portion of the foreign trade if the American meat came as a permanent supply to this market, it would very much increase the amount of meat in the country, and it would not stop the entire foreign supply; and therefore the consumers would be largely benefited by the reduction in price?—As has been stated in the evidence, it is a question of a very small amount of money that would stop the supply from the Continent or from elsewhere. If they can realise in France or in any continental market 10 *s.* a bullock more than they can realise here, they will send them there.

9029. We are, therefore, always liable, as prices fluctuate, to this supply being taken from us?—Quite so.

9030. And in consequence of the American trade during the last few months, we have not suffered by the prohibition of the foreign supply?—Quite so; and it strikes one as being rather a curious argument to use that the loss on animals going to Deptford amounts to between 2 *l.* and 3 *l.* per head to the consignor, whereas it is stated by the same witness that 10 *s.* difference in the price would divert it to Paris or to any other continental market. I could not follow that argument for the life of me.

9031. Have you considered whether the dead-meat trade could be regulated so as to prevent these sudden gluts, that might drive away the supply?—I do not think that it is desirable to interfere with the gradual extinction of the live meat supply; it is very gradually taking place. As a matter of fact, although there has been, of course, within the last 10 years, an increase in the population of London, to the extent of, say, from 500,000 to 800,000, the live cattle supply has absolutely been diminishing; as shown by our returns, there has been a very considerable falling off during the last 10 years.

9032. And that you attribute to the fact that the merits of a dead meat supply are gradually becoming appreciated?—Quite so. I may say that, this morning, we have had in the Meat

Mr. *Rudkin.*

2 July 1877.

Chairman—continued.

Market at Smithfield, 60 tons of Scotch meat; and the average weight of Scotch meat during the hot months reaches from 60 tons to 70 tons per day; so that there is really no difficulty whatever in bringing meat slaughtered in Scotland to London, even in the hottest part of the year.

9033. And that is under conditions which are less favourable to the carriage of the meat than it is supposed will be put in force with regard to the American meat?—I know nothing of the process, and therefore I cannot express an opinion, I simply give the fact. As a fact, we get meat from all parts of the country, from the most extreme points of England and Wales, and even from Ireland, in the hottest months, and we get it in perfect condition; in point of fact, it is purchased in preference to town-killed meat, and eaten in preference to town-killed meat.

9034. And in the hottest weather it travels perfectly well, getting over, therefore, the difficulty that has been suggested as to the slaughter at the ports?—Certainly; there is no difficulty about that

9035. That dead-meat trade, I understand you to say, has increased rather than diminished, of late years?—The first year that the Dead-meat Market was opened, I think that the quantity of meat that came to it was 120,000 tons; I think, last year, it exceeded 175,000 tons; and that has been the quantity of meat that has been required to feed the increased population of London. It has been a dead supply, and not a live supply.

9036. Is there any other point that you would wish to mention to the Committee?—I should like to say that some eight or nine years back an application was made to me by Sir Harry Verney for assistance to establish slaughter-houses in the agricultural districts. I am myself very strongly of opinion that that would be a very desirable thing to do. I think that the home producer then would have an opportunity of testing his powers of supplying London and the large towns with animals slaughtered near the places where they are fed; and certainly it would be an immense saving to the producers, as it would also be to the consuming public, because they would have really more meat to eat.

9037. I suppose you would leave that to the general development of the trade, would you not?—I think so, much as I would the live cattle trade or the American supply.

9038. I understand that you would let the dead-meat trade fight its own way, and you believe that, from its merits, it would eventually become the trade of the country?—Quite so.

9039. Whilst, for the purpose of stopping the introduction of disease, you suggest that the cattle coming from abroad should be slaughtered at the port?—Yes.

9040. And you see no difficulties in their being so slaughtered, and being sent as carcases to supply the wants of the inland towns, where they have in the past relied upon the live animal?—Quite so. Some question was raised by one of the witnesses as to railway accommodation at Deptford. There would be no difficulty about that at all. We are within a stone's throw of the London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway at Dead Man's Dock, and that was considered when the market was established.

9041. May I ask why it has not been carried out since; has it been in consequence of the trade being a fluctuating trade?—In consequence of

Chairman—continued.

there being no certainty as to the continuance of the animals coming to Deptford.

9042. That has been the reason which has actuated the Corporation?—I apprehend that the Corporation would not do it, but a railway company would not construct a branch line into the market unless they foresaw the continuance of a permanent supply.

Mr. *W. E. Forster.*

9043. You have been for 20 years on the Markets Committee, I think?—For 19 years.

9044. The interest that you have taken in this subject, as a member of the Markets Committee, has led, I presume, to your becoming acquainted with the circumstances of the trade, as regards the importer, the seller, and the home salesman?—Yes, certainly.

9045. You have also been obliged to consider the interests of the consumers throughout the metropolis?—Quite so.

9046. Your own business has brought you a good deal into contact with the trade, has it not?—Yes, certainly. I think I know almost every man in the trade.

9047. You have been interested in an hotel in the central meat market, I believe?—Yes.

9048. And that has, of course, brought you into contact with a great many of the persons engaged in that market?—That has shown me also, beyond all controversy, that the meat trade themselves eat nothing but country-killed meat; they will not have anything else.

9049. You found that necessary in providing market dinners?—Quite so.

9050. Will you tell the Committee when the Deptford Market was opened?—In 1871, I think, it was opened.

9051. Did more animals arrive at that market last year than arrived in 1872?—Yes.

9052. Were there many more?—A few more.

9053. But the growth has not been considerable since the first year, has it?—No; but there has been a steady increase.

9054. Both in cattle and in sheep?—Yes.

9055. I am now going to ask you some questions with regard to the interest, or the supposed interest, of the Corporation in favour of one market as against another; and although I think it necessary to ask the question, as I find there is that impression, I should not wish it to be supposed that I think the Corporation is acting from interested motives. What are your charges at Deptford, say for a bullock?—Five shillings.

9056. What is it for a sheep?—Ninepence.

9057. And what is it for a calf?—One shilling and sixpence.

9058. At Islington Market, is not the charge for a bullock 6 *d.*?—Yes.

9059. And for a sheep 1½ *d.*?—Yes.

9060. And for a calf 4 *d.*?—Yes.

9061. Supposing those figures to be right, it is reckoned out that if 3,000 beasts, 20,000 sheep, and 800 calves, were regularly unloaded at Deptford instead of at Islington, the Corporation would get 1,560 *l.* at Deptford as against 192 *l.* 10 *s.* at Islington?—I have no doubt that that is correct.

9062. Besides that, a good deal of meat which is killed at Deptford goes to the Metropolitan Meat Market, does it not?—Yes.

9063. There is a toll there, is there not?—Yes.

9064. What

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

9064. What is that toll?—One farthing for 21 pounds of meat, 2 *s.* 3 *d.* per ton.

9065. So that there, again, the Corporation would gain?—Yes.

9066. I have also heard it stated that the carcase butchers pay from 50 *l.* to 80 *l.* per annum for slaughter-houses at Deptford, is that so?—Yes.

9067. Altogether, then, the assertion is that the Corporation would have an increase of income of at least 50,000 *l.* per annum if the foreign animals were all ordered to be slaughtered at Deptford?—If the present prices are kept on at Deptford they would.

9068. I should like to know the reply that you would make to the view that is expressed by these assertions?—First of all, it is true that we get an extra toll on animals that are slaughtered at Deptford and that go to the Central Meat Market; but we also get an extra toll on the cattle which are slaughtered at the Copenhagen Cattle Market that go to the Central Meat Market. A very large proportion of the animals that go to the Islington Cattle Market find their way into the Central Meat Market to be sold. Then at Deptford we are wharfingers as well as market proprietors; we provide the wharfage. When they went to Brown's Wharf, or to Thames Haven, they had to pay 2 *s.* 6 *d.* per bullock for landing at the wharf. That is included in our 5 *s.* at Deptford, independently of which the 5 *s.* includes 10 days' lairage of the animal as well as the market charges. It is a lump sum of 5 *s.* to cover all charge. If they remained at Copenhagen Cattle Market for 10 days, they would have to pay the Corporation 3 *d.* per head per night; that would be 2 *s.* 6 *d.* for the lairage. Then there would be 2 *s.* 6 *d.* wharfage at Thames Haven, and then there would be the railway charge from Thames Haven to the Cattle Market. Therefore the charge at Deptford is very much less in proportion than the charge on an animal after it leaves the vessel at Thames Haven, or at Brown's Wharf.

9069. Do you always charge the 5 *s.*, whether the animal remains for one night or for 10 nights?—Exactly the same.

9070. As you do not make a compulsory charge for lairage at Islington, but only charge by the night, why could you not do the same at Deptford?—If the whole of the foreign animals went to Deptford, and the revenue of the Corporation were to be considered excessive, that is to say, if it were larger than would recoup the Corporation, the loss that they have already incurred on the market, and the loss that accrues to them from the abstraction of the foreign animals from the Islington Cattle Market (because there is a very large falling off in the returns from the Islington Cattle Market at Islington, in consequence of the foreigners going to Deptford), if it was considered then desirable that there should be a reduction in those charges, I am quite sure that the Corporation would be prepared to listen to that. In fact, you will remember that when those charges were originally fixed, it was understood that they were simply to be for two or three years, to see how they worked.

9071. Those charges were inserted in the Act of Parliament as the maximum, but it was not contemplated that they should not be altered?—Quite so; in fact, the Corporation recognise it as the principle upon which they conduct their markets that they do not desire to realise a large revenue from their markets. They think that when they are repaid their outlay with fair interest for their money and the working expenses, the tolls should be reduced as necessity requires.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

9072. Going back to the history of the Deptford Market, it was in consequence of the Act, which it was my duty to carry through Parliament, that the establishment of the Deptford Market was in fact made compulsory upon you; that is to say, unless you got it open within a certain time, you would have lost your monopoly of the markets in the metropolis; was not that so?—Quite so; but there is nothing very valuable in it.

9073. Still that was the fact?—Yes, that was so.

9074. But I understand that you think it unfair to compare this 5 *s.* which is charged at Deptford with the 6 *d.* which is charged at Islington, because in the 5 *s.* is included not merely the lairage for the beast while it is waiting for purchase, but also your wharfage charge for allowing it to be landed?—Quite so.

9075. I want you to give the Committee rather more distinctly your reason for saying that the importer has to pay quite as much, if not more, to get his beast to Islington than he has to pay to get it to Deptford?—I thought I had given it to you, but we will go over it again. If an animal is landed at Thames Haven, the Thames Haven Company charge 2 *s.* 6 *d.* for wharfage dues. There is the railway carriage of the animal from Thames Haven to the Cattle Market; I do not know what that is, but I think it is 1 *s.* 6 *d.*; that makes 4 *s.* Then there are the market dues at the Cattle Market, which makes 4 *s.* 6 *d.*, assuming that it remains 10 days at the Cattle Market, because it is permitted to do so at Deptford if they like; that would be 2 *s.* 6 *d.* for lairage, making 7 *s.*

9076. Assuming that it remains three days, what would that be?—That would be 9 *d.*

9077. That would bring it up to 5 *s.* 3 *d.* as against 5 *s.*?—Yes.

9078. Supposing that the beast does not come to Thames Haven, but comes to Brown's Wharf, what then?—It is the same thing.

9079. Minus the railway charge?—Yes, but it costs just the same to drive it; it has to be driven, and a drover has to be paid for it.

9080. Then I understand that your reply to this statement is this: That, in the first place, there is no present loss to the importer; and, in the second place, that if it turned out that you could reasonably be expected to make lower charges at Deptford, in consequence of a larger arrival of animals, the Corporation would be prepared to make that change?—Quite so. We were compelled to have a market at the water side in consequence of its being necessary to have a wharf to land the animals; the result was that we had to give considerably more for the land for those wharves than we could have acquired land for in other parts of London. Our three wharves cost us over 40,000 *l.*

9081. I believe that the Deptford Market has cost you a tolerable sum of money altogether?—It cost us 235,000 *l.*

9082. I think there was some set-off, was there not, in the fact that you were empowered to make higher charges at the Islington Market?—That was so.

9083. What

Mr. *Rudkin.*

2 July 1877.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

9083. What was the change?—The change was from to 3½ *d.* to 6 *d.* on cattle, and from about 1 *d.* to 1¼ *d.* on sheep.

9084. It has been stated in the course of the evidence that the commission charged upon a foreign animal was 8 *s.*, as compared with 4 *s.* upon a home animal; are you aware whether that is so?—I know nothing of the commission.

9085. You have told the Committee that you would be in favour of ordering all the animals that come to London to be slaughtered at the port of landing, which means at Deptford; I suppose that that is an opinion at which you have arrived by the experience of the last three or four years?—Yes; I am sorry to have to include Denmark, but I am afraid that we must have one regulation.

9086. I am right, am I not, in thinking that that is an opinion based upon the experience of working the two markets side by side, and that you were not of that opinion on the first opening of the market?—No; we had not that opinion originally. We see now that the thing works without any very serious detriment or loss to any person.

9087. We have had witnesses who have gone into the detail, who say that there is a loss of between 2 *l.* and 3 *l.* per animal if sold at Deptford; might not that special loss have arisen from their being unexpectedly obliged to take the cattle to Deptford?—Yes.

9088. And, therefore, it would be unfair, would it not, to suppose that that would be a loss that would occur when it was understood throughout the trade that they were to come there?—Assuming that animals were taken to Thames Haven and landed, and that one was found to be suffering from foot-and-mouth disease, the Thames Haven Company would charge the wharfage charges on all the animals which were landed, and then there would be the expense of transshipping them and taking them up to Deptford.

9089. Not taking the positive orders that were in existence this spring in consequence of cattle plague, but taking last year, it was not unfrequently the case, I believe, that after the cargo had left the Continent, the importer, having expected to take it to Islington Market, would find that he was obliged to take it to Deptford?—Yes; there were several instances of that sort.

9090. Of course that uncertainty would have a very bad effect upon the chance of the cargo selling well?—Yes; and not only that, but it makes the salesman and the person to whom the cattle belong very cross indeed; he does not like to have the whole cargo stopped for one animal. They are under the impression that if one animal is slaughtered everything else should go free, and they do not seem to recognise the fact that the whole of their animals may be tainted.

9091. And I suppose that they are less the likely to be resigned, and the more likely to feel sore, because, if home cattle come into the Islington Market, and a good many of them are diseased, the rest do not suffer any inconvenience at all?—Quite so; but I think they are wrong in that.

9092. How long have you been of opinion that we ought to have a cordon round London?—I suggested it to Sir George Grey when he was Home Secretary in 1865, when cattle plague first broke out.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

9093. Supposing that you were made the head officer to the Privy Council and could do as you liked, would you do both things; that is to say, order the animals to be all slaughtered at Deptford and establish a cordon, or would you only do one of them?—If you keep the cordon, I do not myself individually think that there is any necessity for the Deptford Market. I believe that the whole of the animals could be safely sent to the Copenhagen Cattle Market if you prohibited import from any country where cattle plague exists. I think that that would be a great deal better for all interests concerned; it would be certainly much better for the Corporation, and the trade would be better satisfied with it.

9094. What would then become of the Deptford Market?—I apprehend that the Corporation would have to do the same as it has done before, viz., put up with the loss.

9095. Would there not be considerable danger of smuggling through the cordon?—Not, I think, if the Privy Council were the local authorities for London, and established a cordon, and had the assistance of the police to keep it up.

9096. At the present moment is every animal that comes in branded?—The hair is cut off the tail of every animal that comes into the cattle market, but there is nothing in that. In many of the London cow-sheds they cut the hair off the tail for the purpose of keeping the animals clean.

9097. I can understand an objection being made to the continuance of a cordon in the interests of the London consumer, and that is, that anything which checks import would eventually be to his disadvantage, and that fewer animals would come in if they lost the chance of the outside market; have you considered that opinion?—Certainly; I think that the London consumer will be perfectly satisfied if you allow him to get his supply from any part that he can, and if they are live animals to have them slaughtered within the metropolitan district. I think that would be an immense boon to the metropolitan consumer, certainly.

9098. But what I mean is this: that while it is known that if more animals than are wanted come into London the surplus can find a market outside, is it not probable that there will be a larger import than if the importers know for a certainty that they cannot get a market outside?—If that were so then the price of meat in London would go down, and the English producer, who has the power either to send his things to the Copenhagen Market or keep them away, would keep them away.

9099. Still, I suppose, you would admit that it would be a restriction of trade which would not be desirable, except for the purpose of preventing disease?—Certainly everything should be free if we had no disease; this is simply a protection against disease.

9100. I understand you to say that you have great confidence in the future of the dead-meat trade, but you have no wish to give it any sort of legal protection or help?—Certainly not.

9101. What do you think would be the effect of carrying out the proposal which has been made by some persons of stopping the import of all foreign live animals into London?—I do not see the necessity for it.

9102. But what do you think would be the effect of it?—I do not think that we should get the

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

the meat from the Continent for the moment, though I think that possibly, in course of time, we should so; but it would very much interfere with the price of meat in this country, perhaps for a year or two.

9103. I suppose you would not like to be the official that had to face the consumers of London with that increase of price?—No, I do not myself think there is any practical necessity for it.

9104. With regard to the comparison between the Deptford and the Islington markets, do you object to telling me your opinion as to why it is that large importers, like those witnesses whom we have had before us, evidently think it so much to their interest to have their cattle sent to the Islington Market, instead of to the Deptford Market?—Every salesman and every person connected with the cattle trade is desirous of being perfectly free from restriction. They do not consider at all the question of rinderpest, or of foot-and-mouth disease, or of pleuro-pneumonia; the only thing that they consider, as every one in trade considers, is the best way to realise a profit. They know perfectly well that if their trade is quite free they can get a better price for their things, and get more things consigned to them, and get more commission, and more money in the year than they can when there are restrictions.

9105. You think that when Mr. Gebhardt gives evidence in that direction it is simply that he, with the natural feelings of a large tradesman, is against any kind of Government interference that he can help?—Yes, but I think that Mr. Gebhardt takes a rather more cosmopolitan view of the question than most of the cattle salesmen do; he is much more liberal in his views than most of them; but the tendency of his mind, of course, like that of every salesman's mind, is to be let alone to do as he likes.

9106. What is the distance of railway that will have to be made to put Deptford on to the railway system?—I do not think that it exceeds 300 yards.

9107. What railway company would be likely to do it?—The London, Brighton, and South Coast.

9108. Do you think that the Committee might reasonably suppose that if the Government were to order that all foreign cattle should be slaughtered at Deptford and if that order were to remain in force, we might be pretty well assured that that railway would be made?—I think there is no doubt of it. There was one little connecting link that was wanted some six or seven years ago between the Deptford Market and the meat market, independently of those 300 yards; and that little connecting link near to the Blackfriars station has been completed.

9109. Going now to the question of the American dead meat, you mentioned that last Monday you saw some meat in excellent condition which fetched 7 *d.* per pound?—Rather over 7 *d.* per pound.

9110. What was the price on the same day for good country-killed meat?—Ninepence per pound.

9111. Then that 2 *d.* would be clear profit to the butcher, would it not?—Quite so.

9112. He would make no difference in selling between one and the other?—No.

9113. And the butcher would naturally be strongly in favour of the dead-meat trade?—Yes.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

9114. What do you think is the feeling amongst the consumers; have they still a prejudice against the American meat?—For a short time (and I cannot understand the reason why) the retail butchers of London seemed to have set their faces against American meat altogether. I can only account for it in this way: that they desired to convey an opinion to the public that they were really not supplying them with it; and it had the effect of preventing the American meat coming to London, and it was sold in the country instead.

9115. Is it not the case, that although to the Chairman and myself, who would only judge of the meat by what we saw when the joint came to table, the appearance would be good, yet to anybody who went and bought the meat at the butchers, it does not look as good as the country killed meat?—That which I saw on Monday certainly looked as fine as any home-bred Norfolk that I ever saw in my life.

9116. But sometimes it is the case, is it not, that even when it is good meat to eat it has a sort of sodden look?—Yes, that is when it is imperfectly packed; but every now and then it comes in perfect order.

9117. You made a statement to the Committee, for which I daresay there is a good deal of foundation, that the condition of the meat on arriving in England was partly owing to the long railway journey which the animals had to undergo in America before being slaughtered; but do you not look forward to the animal being slaughtered before it undergoes the railway journey in some cases?—I do

9118. For instance, why should it not be slaughtered at Chicago just as well as at New York?—Quite so. I believe it will come to that.

9119. With regard to the large increase of population in London, accompanied by no increase or if anything a decrease in the importation of live cattle into London, whether country grown or foreign, I suppose no one could state that the population of London consumes less meat per head than they used to do?—They consume a very great deal more, I think.

9120. Would you not consider, not taking one month with another, or one six months with another, according to the condition of trade, but taking five years with five years, that we have good reason to hope that the population of London consume more meat than they formerly did?—Quite so.

9121. And therefore this increase of consumption from increased population and from increased power of purchase must have been supplied by the dead-meat trade?—Exactly.

9122. Can you give the Committee any notion as to whether the relative consumption of beef and mutton has altered within the last 20 years?—I think that there is more beef and less mutton consumed, in consequence of the increased price of mutton; mutton is much more expensive than beef.

9123. With regard to the powers of the Privy Council in the metropolis, will you tell the Committee what is the present position of the local authorities; there are two local authorities in the metropolis, are there not?—Yes; the Metropolitan Board of Works are the local authority for the whole of the metropolis with the exception of the City of London and the Deptford

Mr. *Rudkin.*

2 July 1877.

Mr. *Rudkin.*

2 July 1877.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

Market; and there the Privy Council have the power to inspect, and seize, and condemn.

9124. Is there not some degree of inconvenience from, or at any rate anomaly in, the fact that while the City is the sole market authority for the metropolis, yet that the City is only the local authority within its own borders?—It is the local authority under the third part of the last Act of Parliament for the construction of the Deptford Market, but, curiously enough, we have not the power to seize and condemn.

9125. But you are also the only authority for providing markets within the metropolis, are you not?—That is so. At the Copenhagen Cattle Market we are not the local authorities over our own market; the Metropolitan Board of Works are the local authority there.

9126. In which of the districts outside of the City is the Copenhagen Market?—In the Islington district.

9127. Taking the cattle that arrive from abroad when there is no cattle plague, do the majority of those that do not go to Deptford go to Thames Haven?—Yes; certainly the larger proportion of them.

9128. To what other places do they come?—To Brown's Wharf.

9129. Is there any other place besides Brown's Wharf and Thames Haven?—I think that they come to Blackwall, but very few come there; I think that Blackwall is closed now.

9130. I find by the last Report of the Veterinary Department of the Privy Council that, in 1876, there were many more animals, taking cattle, sheep, and swine, together, landed at Brown's Wharf than at Thames Haven?—Possibly there were more sheep landed at Brown's Wharf. There might be perhaps 100,000 sheep landed there, but there are a great many more cattle landed at Thames Haven; in fact, I think comparatively few sheep come to Thames Haven; they are almost all cattle.

9131. It appears that in 1876, there were 580,191 animals, including cattle, sheep, and swine, landed at Brown's wharf, as against 73,147 at Deptford, and 288,066 at Thames Haven; but that of the cattle there were 20,472 landed at Brown's Wharf, 21,860 landed at Deptford, and 105,204 landed at Thames Haven?—That is so.

9132. There do not seem to have been any cattle landed anywhere else than at those three places?—That is all.

9133. You mentioned, as a curious illustration of the power of conveying deat meat over England, that you felt sure that foreign sheep were slaughtered in London and went to Cardiff, and came back to London; do you say that, knowing that there has been such a case?—Yes, certainly.

9134. You can assure the Committee almost positively that, taking such a town as Leeds, for instance, it would not suffer so far as its supply from London was concerned, if it could only get dead meat from London without getting live meat from London?—Simply with the exception of the offals, and that difficulty I say can be very readily overcome, if the trade will only turn their attention to it in a practical form.

9135. With that exception, you feel sure that as much beef or mutton would arrive at Leeds from London as arrives there now?—Quite so; in fact they are now receiving large quantities; van loads after van loads go away from Deptford

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued

every day. The vans are so constructed that the sheep are slaughtered, and they are placed on hooks on rails in the vans; they come from the slaughter-house and they are sent straight away by rail at once.

9136. The completion of the railway communication at Deptford, would be a great help to that trade I suppose?—Certainly, it would go much more rapidly, and it would get rid of the vans. A tram would run in front of the slaughter houses, and the meat would be put in the railway trucks and taken away at once.

9137. Another reason was given, why the Islington Market was a better market than the Deptford Market, and that was this; that only the large carcase butchers could come to Deptford, because only such butchers could come as had capital enough to take a slaughter-house from you, and that therefore they had the trade to themselves without the competition of the small butchers, who drive the animals off to their own slaughter-houses, and keep them as long as they wish; what do you say to that?—That is so up to the present time to a certain extent; but if the orders were made permanent, the Corporation would be prepared at once to construct a sufficient number of slaughter-houses, to give conveniences for the smaller purchasers. But as a matter of fact now, every person who chooses to go there, can have a slaughter-house where he can slaughter one, two, three, or, say, 50 beasts, according to the number he purchases. We keep that in our own hands, so as to be able to provide it for the trade if they require it.

9138. The population immediately around Deptford may be considered to be larger than almost that of any town of the kingdom, may it not?—I do not think there is much in that. I think that almost every bit of meat which is slaughtered in Deptford goes right away to the meat market in Smithfield, or right away into the country at once.

9139. Does much meat go from the Metropolitan Cattle Market into the country?—Not nearly so much as from Deptford. It is the foreign sheep that they take away principally to the country and the manufacturing districts.

Mr. *Wilbraham Egerton.*

9140. I understand you to offer two alternatives: either a cordon round London, or else the slaughter of all foreign animals at the port of debarkation?—I go further than that; I would not allow anything to leave the metropolitan district alive that has once been in the Metropolitan Cattle Market at Islington.

9141. When you speak of a cordon round London, I understand you to mean that nothing should go alive out of a certain district around London into the country?—Quite so; that is the broad principle.

9142. Then you would allow live foreign animals, Dutch animals, or Danish animals, to come into the London market under those conditions?—Quite so, for slaughter anywhere within the metropolitan district.

9143. The alternative to that would be, that you would have all foreign animals, even Danish animals, which you admit are tolerably free from disease, slaughtered at Deptford?—Yes; I think that that would be the best in the interest of the consumers, of the trade, and of all persons concerned.

9144. Would

Mr. *Wilbraham Egerton*—continued.

9144. Would not the effect of live animals being prevented from being imported into London be to diminish the import of animals to the Deptford Market?—The price in England will always bring the foreign animals; there is no fear of that.

9145. Do you not think that the foreign trade will be rendered much more uncertain by the competition of dead meat from America, or by the importation of live animals from America during the summer?—So much the better for the English consumer.

9146. There has been a fear expressed by some witnesses that, between the two stools, so to speak, we should fall to the ground; that if we discouraged the import of foreign animals, we should not get a sufficient quantity of American dead meat to fill up the gap; is that your opinion?—That is the reason why I would not suggest any discouragement of the foreign supply. I believe that slaughtering the foreign animals at Deptford, instead of being a discouragement, would rather facilitate the trade.

9147. We have heard from Denmark that what would be equivalent to a dead-meat trade would discourage the trade from Denmark altogether?—I do not think that it would be considered equivalent to a dead-meat trade.

9148. You think that slaughtering at Deptford would satisfy the trade?—I think that they would continue to come in very large numbers, in much larger numbers than they do now, if the orders were permanent.

9149. Is offal now sent to Manchester and other large towns in the north from Deptford?—I believe there has been some small amount sent, but it was not found to be satisfactory, and they discontinued it.

9150. How would you treat the offal if animals were slaughtered, as you propose, in country slaughter-houses; that is to say, in slaughter-houses on the farms, or in the neighbourhood of farms?—There is no reason why you should not have the same process there as in any large slaughter-houses on the Continent. Where there are two, or three, or more slaughter-houses congregated together you will find a *triperie* established for the purpose. Then those offals could be sent all over the country; in fact they will keep much longer when they are once dressed than they will before. I daresay that most honourable Members have seen how beautifully the sheeps' trotters are turned out in Paris, and delicious food they are, too.

Mr. *Ritchie.*

9151. With reference to the questions which were put to you by the Right honourable gentleman, the Member for Bradford, as to how far it was the interest of the City that the cattle should be slaughtered at Deptford, I think you said that one of the reasons for the high cost of Deptford was that it included the wharfage?—Yes.

9152. Wherever the cattle were landed they would have to pay wharfage?—Quite so.

9153. But still it is the interest of the Corporation that they should receive that wharfage, is it not?—Yes; but I may say, speaking in the interests of the Corporation, and as their mouthpiece on this occasion, that I hope you will not consider our interests in any shape or form; we simply give our evidence and our views entirely on public grounds. The Corporation of London

Mr. *Ritchie*—continued.

do not consider the question of money at all in this case, and they never have done so from the commencement.

9154. With reference to the offal, are they now able to get rid of all the offal of the cattle slaughtered at Deptford?—Yes, contractors take it away, and there is no difficulty in getting rid of it.

9155. Where does it go to principally?—It goes to the principal tripe dressers and trotter shops in London.

9156. Is a great deal of it consumed in the neighbourhood of Deptford?—A considerable quantity of it would be consumed in all the poor neighbourhoods.

9157. Do you think that by slaughtering the cattle at Deptford there would be any chance of the meat being made cheap in London and dear in the country?—I think not.

9158. You spoke about Mr. Gebhardt's evidence, as being very reliable or cosmopolitan; you do not agree, I suppose, with his answer, when he is asked this question: "Supposing that all the cattle that came into the port of London were to be slaughtered at Deptford, what effect would it have upon the inland markets at the great centres of industry, such as Birmingham and Sheffield, and those places?" and he answers: "The effect would be that those places, which are now great consumers, could not get that class of meat which they require, and they would be obliged to buy the English meat, which is comparatively dearer, which makes more money; and perhaps a great many of them would go without meat, not having the cheaper food at their market"?—My answer to that is, that they do get it now. Thousands of sheep are slaughtered at Deptford, day after day, and are sent down to them.

9159. I put this question to Mr. Gebhardt: "Do they not bring dead meat up from Aberdeen?" and his answer was: "Yes, they do; but that is quite different; in Aberdeen, first of all, it is much colder, and very little comes from Aberdeen in summer." I then asked him: "It may be colder in Aberdeen, but it has to go through a warmer climate before it comes to London, has it not?" and he replied: "Yes, but I tell you very little does come from Aberdeen to London in hot weather"?—Sixty tons of meat came from Scotland to-day into the meat market.

9160. Then, so far as your experience goes, there is no foundation for the opinion which has been given here by Mr. Gebhardt?—Quite so. That meat must have left Scotland before Sunday morning. They will not allow it to be put on board the railway on Sunday, and therefore it must have been put on the railway on Saturday, and must have been in the trucks all day on Sunday.

9161. Therefore you do not anticipate any difficulty in the great centres of industry if the animals are all slaughtered at the port of embarkation?—The fact that London is now supplied from the country with 175,000 tons of meat per annum proves that meat can fairly and properly be killed in the country and brought to London to be consumed.

9162. Therefore, in your opinion, there is no risk of any such consequences as that?—There is no reason why a large number of animals might not, on the other hand, be slaughtered in London and sent into the country.

Mr. *Rudkin*

2 July 1877.

Mr. *Ritchie*—continued.

9163. You made a remark which struck me at the time, and you said that you regretted to have to give the opinion, that the only remedy was slaughter at the port of debarkation; why do you regret it?—Because I am in favour of freedom, as much as possible; but I am afraid that nothing else will do it.

9164. Have you any special reason for that?—Denmark has been mostly free from disease, according to the evidence which I have read, and it appears to be a pity to include it; but unless you have a rule that covers the whole thing, I am afraid it will not work. The Spanish cattle certainly come very full of foot-and-mouth complaint.

9165. In reference to the difficulty which small butchers would have in getting slaughter-houses at Deptford, I think you said that the Corporation were willing to put up slaughter-houses to accommodate the butchers?—We are constructing sheep slaughter-houses now. As applications are made from time to time, the Corporation provide the necessary requirements.

9166. As I understood you, the difficulty which the small butchers would have is that at present they have their slaughter-houses behind their own shops, and they have men whom they employ in other portions of their business, who are there to slaughter the animals when they have to be slaughtered; and that difficulty could not, of course, possibly be met at Deptford?—There are 5,000 butchers in London, and there are about 1,100 slaughter-houses; therefore there are 4,000 butchers who provide their customers with meat without having slaughter-houses at the back of their shops, and I cannot see why the other 1,000 cannot do the same.

9167. I suppose the slaughter-houses are principally connected with the small butchers, are they not?—No, not necessarily; they are principally connected with the retail butchers. There is no difficulty in every carcase butcher having a slaughter-house at Deptford if he thinks fit.

9168. So far as regards the men being on the spot in the shop, the small butcher would be at a disadvantage in having to slaughter at Deptford, would he not?—The foreign trade and the English trade are quite distinct; the men who deal in the foreign cattle, that is to say, the carcase butchers, do not deal in English cattle; it is almost a distinct and separate trade. There are a few men in the trade who purchase both English animals and foreign animals, and slaughter them both.

Mr. *Dease.*

9169. When you say that dead meat is sent from Deptford inland, is ice ever used for its preservation?—No.

Mr. *Norwood.*

9170. With regard to your scheme of slaughter at the port of debarkation, that would put a very great stop to the importation of foreign milch cows, would it not?—I do not see why the foreign milch cows could not be imported at some place far away from London where a quarantine should be established.

9171. Then you admit that a quarantine might meet that case?—Possibly.

9172. Then your idea of compulsory slaughter would stop short at milch cows?—Quite so, because if you attempt to keep fat animals a sufficient time to quarantine them they will lose so much in weight and in quality that it will not answer the purpose of the exporter to send them.

Mr. *Norwood*—continued.

9173. But I presume that those milch cows are of great value to the people, or they would not come; and you say you would put them under such restrictions that you would practically prohibit them without actually doing it; do you not think that it would be a misfortune if the large number of milch cows that come from Holland were peremptorily stopped from being imported?—If I am pressed home as to that, I must say, I do not think that it would be any very great misfortune; I think that there are quite sufficient milch cows in this country, very much better bred things altogether, and of good quality, that would be used if we had not the disease in the country that we have had from time to time.

9174. You think that we could supply sufficient milk from English bred cows?—I do most certainly.

9175. Can you tell me how you discover from the carcase whether a beast has been killed in the country or in London?—I could tell if I saw it hanging in the meat market.

9176. Is it easy to detect it?—Very easy; a practical man would tell you at once.

Mr. *John Holms.*

9177. You said that whilst there are 5,000 butchers in London, there were only about 1,100 slaughter-houses; has the tendency been to decrease the number of slaughter-houses?—Yes, certainly.

9178. Have you any measure of the number at all?—There were nearly double the number ten years ago that there are now.

9179. That shows that upon the whole the butchers do approve of the dead meat being brought here?—Yes, I know butchers who had slaughter-houses, and who bought animals at the Copenhagan Market alive, and slaughtered them at home; they gave it up of their own accord, and closed their slaughter-houses; and since then they have been buying dead meat, and they have been doing very much better as tradesmen than they did before.

9180. You say that in 1869–70, 120,000 tons of dead meat came; and that in 1876, 175,000 tons come from the country; from what part of the country did that come?—From all parts of the country; I should say, that there is hardly a part of England, Ireland, Scotland, or Wales that we do not get supplies from.

9181. How long will it keep in the hottest weather?—It will keep much longer than meat will if it is slaughtered in London.

9182. Have you any idea how much longer it will keep?—I will give you my own experience. Last Saturday I purchased a side of lamb, and this morning I found that some of that lamb was perfectly sweet; and that lamb had been slaughtered in Scotland on the Wednesday.

9183. Have you any experience of the time that American meat keeps after it arrives?—Yes, I have kept American meat five days in London, and after that it has been perfectly fresh.

9184. Would you say that the American meat kept as long as the home-killed meat?—If it comes into the market in such a condition as I saw on Monday, certainly it would, in my opinion,

Mr. *John Holms*—continued.

opinion, keep much longer than town-killed meat.

9185. As regards the American meat, I think you said that the butchers were rather against it at first, and also that the people had a prejudice against it; do the butchers now readily take American meat?—There is a very ready sale for American meat if it comes in anything like condition; all the butchers purchase it if they get an opportunity.

9186. I think you said that you regarded the gain in the weight of the dead meat that came from the country as at least about 5 per cent., as compared with that killed in London?—Yes, I think that a beast weighing 100 stone, which was slaughtered in London; having come by railway from Aberdeen, would lose at least five stone in weight.

9187. Then that, together with the more scientific treatment of the offal, I suppose, in your opinion, would rather give to the poorer classes a *quid pro quo* for the very cheap price at which they obtain their offal now in bad condition?—I think they can get the offals in better condition, and at a cheaper price, if they are treated properly at a slaughter house, than they can under the existing arrangements.

9188. When you speak of a cordon being placed round London, what distance do you mean?—The metropolitan district it is at present, because the Metropolitan Board of Works, who are the local authorities, have the control of it; but my view is, that that should be placed under the control of the Privy Council, and that the cordon might be larger or smaller, as the case required.

9189. You state that at present the Metropolitan Board of Works have the authority over the Copenhagen Market?—They have.

9190. But you have the full right to make your charges as you like, in the same manner as you make them at Deptford?—We have a limit under the provisions of the Act of Parliament.

9191. I think you said that disease was more prevalent at the Copenhagen Market than at the Deptford Market?—Yes, I think so.

9192. Is there as much attention paid to the disinfecting of the Copenhagen Market as there is at the Deptford Market?—Every attention is paid to it, and from time to time the lairs are scraped out, and disinfected and washed thoroughly.

9193. Then you think that the disease comes from the home animals as well as from the foreign animals?—Every farmer or stock producer, if he finds that he has an animal on his farm which has something the matter with it, he does not know what, naturally sends it to market at once; and no market is so open to him as the cattle market at Islington.

Sir *Rainald Knightley.*

9194. With regard to the American dead meat, we have heard a great deal of evidence that it presents a damp appearance on the outside; and that has been accounted for by the fact that if a cold substance is brought suddenly into a hot atmosphere, it causes condensation; what is the effect upon the American meat when it arrives on a cold day during a frost, when the atmosphere is as cold as it is in the ice chamber?—I have seen American meat in the winter time, and it has looked and eaten remarkably well; in fact

Sir *Rainald Knightley*—continued.

when it comes properly from the box that it is packed in, if it is a proper and fair importation of meat, there is nothing to show that there is anything wrong with it in any shape or form.

9195. I understand that when the weather is cold it does not present that same damp appearance which it does when the weather is very hot?—Some of it does; that which comes imperfectly packed always looks bad.

9196. But when it is properly packed it does not present that damp appearance?—It does not at any period of the year, so far as my experience goes.

Colonel *Kingscote.*

9197. You said that the quantity of live meat brought into London has fallen off, has that increased the price of meat in the country?—I think not; I think that the cattle plague has increased the price of meat in this country and throughout Europe. It practically decimated our stock in this country ten years ago, and we have never recovered from it.

Mr. *Arthur Peel.*

9198. If London was made, so to speak, the area of slaughter, and the Deptford Market abolished, and a cordon drawn round London, what would you do about admitting cattle landwards into London?—There is no reason why they should not come in, but they must not go out again.

9199. You mean that as a protection from the country?—Quite so.

9200. But what precautions would you take to guard London against disease?—There is no reason why we should not have cattle sent into London from the country if they must be slaughtered within a week.

9201. But you would not impose that restriction upon the foreign cattle that they should be slaughtered within a given time, would you?—No, certainly not; for, practically, you would not require an order for that because the trade of their own accord would slaughter the animals; they cannot afford to keep them, because they waste so much.

9202. But when this evidence is established and the animals have to be slaughtered within London, what would be going on at the other ports?—I do not see any reason why there should not be other ports established in the country, such as Hull, Liverpool, and Southampton, and other ports where there are populations; there is no reason why foreign animals should not be imported into those ports and slaughtered there.

9203. On the same conditions as in London?—On the same conditions as in London,

Major *Allen.*

9204. I understand that you are all for free trade in meat, but that you are not for free trade in disease?—That is so.

Mr. *Chaplin.*

9205. I understood you to say, in answer to the Right honourable Gentleman the Member for Bradford, that the effect of stopping the live import would be to raise the price of meat considerably to the consumer for the moment?—Yes.

9206. Do you think that that would be the case if considerable notice, say six months'

Mr. *Rudkin.*

2 July 1877.

Mr. *Chaplin*—continued.

notice, was given before such a measure was adopted?—I do not think that six months would be sufficient; I think that it should be three or four years. I think that you should give time for the producers and the breeders abroad and the trade generally to adapt themselves to the altered circumstances of the case.

9207. But do you think that it would require anything like three or four years for the dead-meat trade from America to be so considerably increased as to take the place of the live-meat trade from the Continent?—I shall be very much astonished if we find within three or four, or even within 10 years, that the dead-meat trade from America has that effect.

Chairman.

9208. With regard to the Deptford Market, Mr. Gebhardt, I think, stated in evidence that English cattle never went to the Deptford Market; is that within you knowledge?—I do not know of any English cattle having gone there, but there is no order to prevent their going; they can be taken if they like.

9209. Has it come within your knowledge that cattle are taken from Islington Market to be slaughtered at Deptford?—That I am not aware of; they have power to do it; but I am not aware that it has taken place.

9210. I suppose that since these restrictions have driven more animals for slaugher into the Deptford Market, the trade depending upon that is more centreing around the Deptford Market, is it not?—No. I think that the persons who frequent the Deptford Market, the buyers and salesmen, reside and carry on their main businesses in the same positions as they did originally.

9211. With regard to the quarantining of milch cows from Holland, do you believe that quarantining them would protect us against the introduction of pleuro-pneumonia from that country?—I would rather not express an opinion upon that subject. I have no scientific knowledge upon the subject.

9212. I suppose it would modify your opinion as to admitting them if the incubation of the disease, being, as is described, two or three months, rendered it necessary to quarantine them during that time?—If that is necessary, then I should certainly prohibit them altogether.

9213. I think I understood you to say that Spainsh cattle now come over full of foot-and-mouth disease?—I said that Spanish cattle had come full of foot-and-mouth disease. I have seen hundreds of them myself at Deptford in a fearful state of foot-and-mouth disease.

Chairman—continued.

9214. Are you aware of the returns for last year, 1876?—I have not seen them.

9215. If you will turn to Table 17 you will find that the importation from Portugal was 14,264, and from Spain 21,116; and that of those there were affected with foot-and-mouth disease 14 from Spain and 158 from Portugal; that does not show any very large amount of foot-and-mouth disease introduced from those countries in that year?—I have seen over 100 Spanish beasts at Deptford suffering with foot-and-mouth disease.

9216. During 1876?—I am not quite certain whether it was the year before, but certainly Messrs. Hope and Harrington imported two or three cargoes that were very bad indeed.

9217. This official return, if it is correct, shows that very few indeed came from Spain that were affected with the disease, and not very many from Portugal?—Possibly I may have seen those numbers; I think they came within a month of each other. The 158 might have been the lot that I saw; they certainly were in a very bad state indeed.

9218. It has been given in evidence before the Committee that, as a rule, the Spanish cattle have, not any more than the Danish cattle, been very subject to these diseases?—That has been proverbial, I believe, in reference to Spanish cattle.

9219. Still, although you wish to allow these animals to come in, you think that, for the sake of getting an uniformity of regulations and conditions which would render the market and the trade a profitable one, they should all be slaughtered at the port?—I think that that would be better, under all the circumstances.

9220. With regard to the Islington Market being closed against animals being taken out of it, no great hardship would fall upon the home trade upon that account?—No.

9221. A farmer, generally, when he sends his animal to market sends it up with a knowledge that it will not pay him to send it to another market, does he not?—Certainly he does. If it went elsewhere to be sold at all it would be taken by a jobber, which is a class of men that it would be a very desirable thing if we could get rid of altogether.

9222. If the market were inclosed, and the cordon were kept on, there would be nothing to prevent the farmer from sending his animal to the market any more than there is now?—Nothing whatever.

9223. Because he would not expect, when he sent it up, to take it away to a further market?—Certainly not.

Mr. Henry Knowles, called in; and Examined.

Mr. *Knowles.*

Mr. *Norwood.*

9224. You are a Cattle and Sheep Salesman at Hull, are you not?—Yes.

9225. And you attend here at the request of the trade, and as their representative?—Yes.

9226. You have some statistics, have you not, with regard to the foreign import?—I have.

9227. I need not trouble you to read them, because the Committee have them in another form. The importation from the Continent into Hull is chiefly from Germany and from Holland, is it not?—Yes.

Mr. *Norwood*—continued.

9228. You receive cattle also from Denmark and from Norway?—Yes, but very few at present.

9229. The reason is that the steamboat facilities are not satisfactory?—That is so.

9230. The import from Germany has been prohibited during the year, has it not?—Yes, since January.

9231. And you cannot now import horned cattle?—Only sheep.

9232. Has that been a great inconvenience to you at Hull?—Very much so.

9233. Have

Mr. *Norwood*—continued.

9233. Have you, in consequence, been compelled to go to Newcastle and to other markets to buy foreign cattle?—Yes, to make up the deficiency.

9234. Who were the chief consumers and customers for foreign cattle in Hull, previously to this year, when the trade was, comparatively speaking, open?—A great many of the butchers and buyers came from inland towns to take it away.

9235. Does a great proportion of the cattle of various kinds go into the interior?—Yes.

9236. Where to?—To Manchester, Sheffield, Wakefield, Leeds, and all those inland towns.

9237. Supposing that the state of things which the last witness alluded to were applied to the ports, that is to say, compulsory slaughter, what effect would that have upon the inland trade; would the butcher in Sheffield or Leeds be under a disadvantage in being compelled to slaughter in Hull?—He would, because when he can take them away alive he gets the offal as well, and he can kill them when he likes, and especially in the summer months.

9238. Can you give an estimate as to what you think would be a fair sum to affix to that loss, that is to say, the difference of advantage between his taking them away alive and his slaughtering them at Hull?—About 1 *l.* per head.

9239. Would not that be a serious item to the importer?—It would, very serious.

9240. Is it a sufficiently considerable loss to the importer to check the importation?—It would considerably; it must do so.

9241. Because, of course, the butchers from Sheffield, Leeds, and Bradford could not afford to pay so much by 1 *l.* per head as they would if they could take them away alive?—Quite so.

9242. With regard to the offal, that is a very important question to the other inland towns, is it not?—It is very important.

9243. There is a large consumption in Hull itself, is there not?—Very large.

9244. What do you estimate the average value of the offal at?—It would make nearly 1 *l.*

9245. What would that offal be worth if it had to be sent to Manchester from Hull; would it deteriorate or not?—Yes, it would not be worth more than one-half if it had to be taken away.

9246. I suppose that that loss would form a portion of the loss of 1 *l.* to which you alluded?—Certainly.

9247. There would be another difficulty if foreign cattle were not permitted to enter Hull alive; there would be a falling off, of course, in the import?—There must be.

9248. And there would be a practical difficulty in Hull with reference to the supply of foreign beef to ships and fishing smacks; you have a great many fishing smacks in Hull, have you not?—There are about 900 from Hull and Grimsby.

9249. They are mostly supplied with foreign beef, are they not?—They are supplied partly with English and partly with foreign beef, but they will not have anything but what is killed in Hull.

9250. Why will they not?—It will not keep. If they get beef that has been in ice and put it in salt it will not keep. Many of them have tried it, and they have had to throw it overboard, and they will not have it.

9251. You mean that the American beef would not salt?—It would not.

Mr. *Norwood*—continued.

9252. But would not beef salt which was killed on the Continent?—For salting properly it requires it to be about 12 hours killed to keep.

9253. There are from 4,000 to 5,000 men on board those smacks, are there not?—Yes, about that number; there are five to each smack, and there are 900 smacks.

9254. What does each man consume per week?—They consume 10 lbs. per man; 50 lbs. the five.

9255. I believe, so far as the Deptford Market is concerned, the import of horned cattle from Tonning is permitted?—Yes.

9256. But it is not permitted into Hull at all yet?—Not at all.

9257. And you, representing Hull, think that the same privilege might be extended to Hull?—I should think so.

9258. And you think that your arrangements at Hull would be equally protective with those at Deptford?—Yes, certainly.

9259. With regard to your arrangements at Hull, are you aware that the corporation have submitted a scheme to the Privy Council which has been approved?—Yes, for a new market.

9260. That the corporation intend giving up their present English cattle market to the foreign trade, and that they have purchased, at a cost of 50,000 *l.*, or thereabouts, a large tract of pasture about two miles off for the English market?—Yes.

9261. So that they will carry on the two trades perfectly distinctly?—Quite distinct altogether.

9262. There would be no possibility of any mixture?—Nothing at all.

9263. This proposed new foreign market is some three acres in extent, I believe?—I think it is more; it is from three to five acres.

9264. And the corporation are about constructing lairs and slaughter-houses, and all possible conveniences?—Yes; all the plans are prepared for it.

9265. You have had some American cattle into Hull lately by Wilson's steamers, have you not?—Yes.

9266. Have you seen them?—I have sold them.

9267. In what condition did they come?—They came in first class condition, and as fresh as though they came by rail or road 20 miles only.

9268. What did you sell them for?—They would average over 31 *l.* each one cargo, and others would average about 30 *l.*

9269. Did you sell some as high as 40 *l.*?—I sold some at 45 *l.* per head.

9270. And those beasts were really as fine as our own English beasts?—They were beautiful.

9271. And they came all the way from New York to Hull in admirable condition?—Beautiful.

9272. Quite lively?—Quite lively; we were obliged to have extra men for them.

9273. One nearly murdered a custom-house officer, I think?—Yes; it is wonderful how fresh they are.

9274. On the other hand, you have seen some of this American dead meat, have you not?—Yes, I have.

9275. How do they like it at Hull?—They will not have it now. I had the first importation of it myself.

9276. Is that really the case, or do the butchers in

Mr. *Knowles.*
2 July 1877.

Mr. *Knowles.*

2 July 1877.

Mr. *Norwood*—continued.

in Hull sell the American dead meat under the disguise of English meat?—No, they do not in Hull.

9277. Then they do not take in the Hull people as they do the people in London?—No, it is reduced 75 per cent. this last week: there is only one party in Hull that sells it now, the people will not buy it.

9278. You have no faith in this iced meat?—No, I have not.

9279. You believe that the importation of dead meat from the Continental ports would not be sufficient to supply the requirements?—Yes.

9280. And if live stock was prohibited you think that it would very much check the importation to Hull?—It would for a good many years.

9281. And you would like to see healthy animals from a non-infected country permitted to travel over the country?—Yes, after due inspection.

9282. But under any circumstances you desire to have the cattle imported alive to be killed at the port of debarkation?—Yes, to be killed at the port of debarkation.

9283. Have you many Dutch cows coming into Hull?—Very few lately.

9284. What was the reason of the falling off there?—I believe that they have not them to send.

9285. The majority of the cows in Hull are English, are they?—The majority of the cows in Hull are English.

9286. What is the freight on a live beast from Hamburg?—15 *s.* a head.

9287. What is it from Holland?—12 *s.* 6 *d.*

9288. Taking all the expenses, is that cheaper than bringing over the carcase?—Yes.

9289. The live animals walk on board and walk off again, and all the rest of it?—Yes, it is quite as cheap, if not cheaper.

9290. Do you know what they charge per quarter for freight for the dead meat?—I do not know.

9291. You are here from Hull to tell the Committee that the prohibition of live animals from the Continent would be a most serious injury, not simply to Hull, but to the great manufacturing towns which Hull supplies in Lancashire and Yorkshire?—Yes.

9292. You consider there is no necessity fo prohibiting them?—None at all.

9293. You think you could slaughter, if need be, all the cattle that could come?—Yes, and we want all that we can get.

Mr. *Elliot.*

9294. Where do most of your cattle come from to Hull?—From Germany and Holland.

9295. Not much from Denmark?—Very few; we had none this year from Denmark.

9296. How do you make out the difference of of 1 *l.* per head between the cost of slaughtering at Hull and the cost of slaughtering at Leeds?—The animal itself is worth 10 *s.* more alive at Leeds.

9297. Does it not deteriorate to that extent by carriage?—It would be only three hours going to Leeds alive by cattle train, and it would not deteriorate in that time.

9298. It would lose 10 *s.* worth surely in that time?—No; it could not lose any.

9299. We have had it in evidence that an

Mr. *Elliot*—continued.

animal coming from Scotland loses five stone?—I would contradict that, because I have been accustomed to the Scotch trade myself; I have sent hundreds of them from Aberdeen both dead and alive, and I have gone on the railway with them, and seen them shown in the market, and I have had them weighed alive before they started, and weighed after they landed after giving them a day's rest.

9300. Will you tell the Committee how you make out the 1 *l.* difference?—The animal is worth 10 *s.* more.

9301. That is for the offal, is it not?—No; that is the animal being alive instead of being dead. If you kill an animal in Hull and send everything to Leeds, all the offal and the carcase and everything, and send, say, the same animal alive, it will will make 10 *s.* more alive than it will make dead, and there is 10 *s.* expenses of killing and all that, which makes up the 1 *l.*

9302. He has to be killed anyhow?—But the expenses are heavier.

9303. Would you send the offal to Leeds supposing that the animal were killed at Hull?—I would send it if I could not dispose of it in Hull.

9304. Do you think that it could be carried?—It could be carried nicely for such a short distance, but it would not carry a long distance.

9305. Of course if it did not carry you would consider it a loss?—You could sell it for something.

9306. Is it a great advantage to the poor of Hull to have all this offal thrown upon them?—It is, and they feel it a great loss not to have it.

Chairman.

9307. I understood you to say that you had tried the American meat for the purpose of salting?—Yes; the smacks have tried it.

9308. Have you tried it?—Yes; I have tried it myself at home.

9309. You have tried to salt the American meat, and have failed?—Yes.

9310. If you were in the room you probably heard the last witness state that he had made the experiment, and with perfect success; but that is not your experience?—No, it is not my experience.

9311. And you say that the sailors at Hull will not use it?—They will not have a pound of it.

9312. You have spoken of "iced meat;" I suppose you mean the American meat which comes over in a cool temperature; it is not iced?—They call it iced meat.

9313. That is only a name given to it?—Yes.

9314. I wanted to know whether it was meat dealt with by a process in which it was iced, and afterwards thawed, or whether it was brought over in a chill temperature which cooled it down, but did not ice it?—Yes; but when it is exposed to the air for a certain time, even in that way, it is sure to get what they call icy, wet and damp.

9315. And that has been the condition in which you have seen the cargoes arrive?—No, not all of them.

9316. Do you think it is possible that the trade being in its infancy, occasionally cargoes get sent over not properly prepared, and that those may be

Chairman—continued.

be the cargoes which you have seen in bad condition?—I have not much experience, but I should think so, from what I have seen.

9317. I think you said that whilst the introduction of cattle was permitted from Schleswig since the 30th into London, coming from the port of Tonning, that permission has not been extended to Hull?—It has not.

9318. And that you thought that it ought fairly to be extended to that port?—It ought to be extended to that port on the same footing.

9319. You are probably aware that there has been considerable discussion as between the central authority and the port of Hull with regard to their markets?—Yes, there has.

9320. And especially with regard to the market which at present exists for the landing of foreign animals?—Yes, that is going to be done away with altogether.

9321. But, as I understand you, that has not been done up to the present time?—No, but I have been told by Mr. Leck that the corporation are going on with the new market as quickly as possible.

9322. Probably when that market is established on conditions which the Privy Council think will give security, the same facilities will be given to Hull as are given to Deptford, which is a separate market?—Yes.

9323. May not the reason of your not having the same privileges extended to you now, arise from the fact that your home market and your foreign market, although they are going to be altered, are still under the old system?—Yes, but the old system is carried out intact in every way.

9324. And that is the system which the Privy Council said was so imperfect that they objected to it?—I do not think that they could improve upon it; it is the same as at Deptford.

9325. Is it not the fact that the present foreign market in Hull is separated only by an almost imaginary line from the home market?—It is not far from the home market.

9326. And that has been the reason which has made this central authority object to the Hull market during the last few years?—But the other market can be changed at any moment, the English market.

9327. But it has not been changed, I understand?—It has not been changed yet, but they could change it in a week's time.

9328. And that is probably the reason which has led to the regulations not being identical at Hull and in London?—It can be changed and made all correct in a week's time.

9329. I understand you also to say that, with regard to the freight of the animal, it was quite as cheap to bring the live animal as the dead carcase?—Yes.

9330. In your next answer you said that you had never brought a dead carcase, and did not know the price?—I do not know the exact price.

9331. It is merely imagination on your part that that is the case; and as you wish it to be the case, you probably imagine it to be so?—No; not so. Anything that I get in that line I know is dearer than the live animals. It is the public opinion.

9332. In purchasing in the market you purchase the dead animal dearer than the live animal; but you have no personal experience of the price, and you cannot tell what is the freight of the carcase, and therefore you cannot compare it positively with the live animals which you say you do know the freight of; knowing that, and not knowing the freight of the other, how can you possibly say, as you have said, that to bring the one was equally as cheap as to bring the other?—Parties that have got them have told me so.

Chairman—continued.

Mr. *Knowles.*

2 July 1877.

Colonel *Kingscote.*

9333. The restrictions which are imposed upon the movement of cattle into and out of Hull are in consequence of the cattle plague having been imported into Hull, are they not?—Yes, from Germany.

9334. You said that these restrictions have injured the trade in Hull; have they increased the price of meat in Hull?—Yes.

9335. More than in any other place or town in the country?—I could not say that. Yes, it has for one class of meat, for the middle class of meat.

9336. Do you pay a higher price for meat at Hull than you pay in any other part of the country?—Yes, for the middling class of meat we pay higher than ever we did in Hull before

9337. Higher than it has been in Leeds, or Manchester, or London?—Yes, higher than it has been. We want that middle class of meat for contracts and for shipping.

9338. Fresh meat?—Yes, fresh meat.

9339. You say it is higher at Hull at this moment than it is in any other town in England?—Middle class beef is.

9340. Do the shippers at Hull buy the meat for their crews in a free open market, or do they contract?—The contractors engage a butcher to supply them at so much per hundred-weight, or so much per pound.

9341. For this middle-class meat?—They get good and middling too, they want a mixture.

9342. You said that the good meat was no higher, did you not?—I said that the middle-class meat was higher.

Sir *Rainald Knightley.*

9343. You said in reference to the loss of offal in the case of the beasts slaughtered in Hull, that it was a loss of one-half, as the offal would be conveyed from Hull to the towns you enumerated, Manchester, Leeds, and those places within a very few hours; how do you account for such a great deterioration in the value?—In the summer months the deterioration must be great; it would not be so much in the winter.

9344. Do you say that it loses half in being conveyed by train for two or three hours?—In summer time it would in the very hot months, but not in the winter time; it is worth more to our population, it is cheaper food to them than anything else they can get, and we have found a very great want of it.

9345. Do you really mean to tell the Committee that the loss on the offal between Sheffield and Hull would be a loss of one-half?—No; it is the difference between the live animal and the carcase that I speak of the difference between an animal going to Leeds alive, and being killed in Hull.

Mr. *Knowles.*

2 July 1877.

Sir *Rainald Knightley*—continued.

9346. Do you maintain that it is a loss of one-half?—One-half of the 10*s.* on the offal.

9347. You stated that the value of the whole offal would be 1*l.*, and that the loss would be one-half, which would be 10*s.*; you mean that the loss on the offal being conveyed from Hull to Sheffield would be one-half?—The loss on the offal and the extra expense of killing in Hull and sending it to Sheffield.

Mr. *Norwood.*

9348. Is it the case that the shippers take this foreign beef very much?—They do not take it at all; it is killed in Hull.

9349. Your chief sale for the Tonning and Hamburg beasts is to the shipping, is it not?—Yes, and some very prime ones as well.

9350. Owing to the prohibition since January you have had a great scarcity of that article, have you not?—We have had a great scarcity of that article.

9351. And you have not been able to supply the shipping in the usual manner?—We have not.

9352. And you have been obliged to go to Newcastle and other places in order to buy

Mr. *Norwood*—continued.

that class of meat to supply the ships?—Yes, I have.

9353. It is not prime good English beef, but it is good wholesome food?—It is.

9354. It is not so prime as Wilson's American beasts?—It is not so prime as Wilson's American beasts.

9355. The arrangement for the landing and slaughtering of animals from scheduled countries is precisely the same as it has been, is it not?—Precisely the same.

9356. And last year you imported something like 7,000 head of cattle from Hamburg and Tonning alone, I see by the statistics?—That would be from Bremen, not from Tonning.

9357. At any rate they were German cattle, and there is the same security now as there was then?—Yes, the very same.

9358. And you say that there is security at the present moment?—There is security at the present moment.

9359. And therefore you still think that the Privy Council might grant the boon and might permit the continuance of the old system until the new premises are opened?—Yes; under as strict regulations as you like.

Wednesday, 4th July 1877.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Assheton.
Mr. Anderson.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Cameron of Lochiel.
Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. James Corry.
Mr. Dease.
Mr. Elliot.
Mr. W. E. Forster.
Sir George Jenkinson.
Mr. King Harman.
Colonel Kingscote.
Mr. M'Lagan.
Sir Rainald Knightley.
Mr. Norwood.
Mr. Pease.
Mr. Arthur Peel.
Sir Henry Selwin Ibbetson.
Mr. Torr.

SIR HENRY SELWIN IBBETSON, BART IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. EDMUND CHARLES TISDALL, called in; and Examined.

Mr. *Tisdall.*
4 July 1877.

Chairman.

9360. I BELIEVE you are the Chairman of the Committee of the Metropolitan Dairymen's Society?—I am.

9361. And you represent before this Committee to-day, the dairymen and dairy farmers of that association?—I do.

9362. Has your association considered the subject which has been referred to this Committee?—To a considerable extent.

9363. Have they met, and come to any resolution upon it?—Yes; they called a meeting, not only of their own members, but of the dairy farmers in the vicinity of London, in March last; and after very much discussion, in which it is only fair to say, that there was some difference of opinion, an unanimous resolution was come to, of which I believe you have a copy, to the effect that all live store stock and milch cows should not enter any of the ports without undergoing an efficient quarantine.

9364. Did they express any opinion as to what quarantine they thought would be required, or was it merely a general expression of opinion in favour of some quarantine, leaving it to the authorities to decide what quarantine was necessary?—They thought that not less than 14 days would be sufficient.

9365. Was that resolution come to, to protect them against the introduction of pleuro-pneumonia, as well as of other diseases?—Yes.

9366. And, in their opinion, 14 days would be sufficient to guarantee them against the introduction into their dairies of that disease by cows from abroad?—Practically, it would. We are not so fearful of pleuro-pneumonia, as we are of foot-and-mouth disease, and rinderpest.

9367. Of course, in the case of either foot-and-mouth disease or of rinderpest, a quarantine of 14 days would probably develop the disease, but, I suppose, in your experience, and from that of your association, pleuro-pneumonia takes very much longer to develop?—It may be so.

9368. And, therefore, although the quarantine would be a protection against foot-and-mouth disease and cattle plague, it would still leave you liable to the introduction of pleuro-pneumonia into your dairies?—To some extent it might; but the difference in the degree of its transmission is so great, that we should consider it a practical protection to our live stock, if we could get them quarantined for 14 days, in order to develop any disease that there might be about them.

Chairman—continued.

9369. Do you yourself farm or breed cattle?—I do. I have three dairy farms, and for many years past I have bred a considerable number of dairy cattle.

9370. In the immediate vicinity of London?—At Kensington, Horton, and Epsom.

9371. Are your dairy sheds within the metropolitan area?—Some of them are; those at Kensington only.

9372. I understand you to say that you breed cattle as well as buy in cows for milking?—I do; but I breed chiefly for milking purposes.

9373. You supply London largely, of course, from so many dairies?—I do.

9374. What number of cows do you generally keep on your farms?—From 100 to 150 cows and young stock.

9375. Is that the average number that you generally have?—Yes.

9376. With the experience which keeping that number of cows must have given you, have you had any pleuro-pneumonia amongst your cows at the dairies?—Yes; both pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease.

9377. Do you believe that foot-and-mouth disease has been introduced into your dairy from foreign animals?—In the first instance, yes; but lately it has not been directly introduced, because I have avoided the London markets; for the last 10 or 15 years I have almost entirely either bought in the country or bred my own stock.

9378. That would lead me to ask you how long you have been engaged in this business?—I have been engaged in it for 30 years myself, but there were three or four generations of us before.

9379. And it was before these last 14 or 15 years

Mr. *Tisdall.*

3 July 1877.

Chairman—continued.

years that your experience of the introduction of foot-and-mouth disease from foreign animals occurred?—Yes.

9380. Since you adopted the system of either breeding your own stock, or buying in from the home supply, you have not had foot-and-mouth disease in your dairy?—I have been very much freer; I go sometimes for four or five years without any instance of the complaint.

9381. Have you suffered from pleuro-pneumonia in your dairies?—Yes, considerably.

9382. Have you been able to trace the origin of pleuro-pneumonia breaking out there?—I have not been able to do so directly.

9383. Has it broken out amongst animals that have been introduced from abroad?—No, not that I could trace. I have never largely bought foreign animals.

9384. You have not bought Dutch cows?—Not often; not to a large extent.

9385. You have stated to the Committee, and I believe it is well known, that there is a great deal of pleuro-pneumonia amongst those animals?—Yes.

9386. And although they are very much sought in general as good milkers for the London dairies, there is that risk attending their introduction?—Yes.

9387. With regard to pleuro-pneumonia, is your experience of it recent, or was it prior to the 15 years in which you have taken these extra precautions?—I experienced it very much more previously to that.

9388. And by care, and either breeding your own stock or buying from areas which you knew were safe, you have avoided pleuro-pneumonia during the last few years?—Almost entirely.

9389. I understood you before to say that you would admit stores from the Continent, and let the cows for dairies come in from the Continent under a quarantine of 14 days?—Quite so.

9390. Do you think that you, with your experience of the necessity of caution in purchasing those animals, would be willing to go and purchase the cows from Holland under a quarantine of 14 days?—Personally, I would never buy a foreign cow.

9391. That is not because the foreign cow is not a very good milker, I suppose, but because of the uncertainty which exists in your mind as to its bringing into your herds these complaints?—Not only that. The English shorthorned cow is so much preferable to any foreign animal, that I believe, in the end, every prudent man would find it to his interest to keep to English-bred animals.

9392. Do you mean that the shorthorn is as good a milker as the Dutch cow?—Quite so.

9393. And being of a larger frame it is a more profitable animal?—Quite so; and for breeding purposes it is infinitely preferable.

9394. Therefore, supposing that it was found that store stock were liable to introduce disease, or that it was necessary to quarantine them for such a length of time as to make it not so much worth the while of the exporter to send them over, you do not think that we should suffer from either the prohibition or the stoppage of this store trade for dairy purposes?—To a very small extent. There is always a certain class of dairymen who will purchase the cheapest cows they can buy, and they get them from the foreign stock, even running great risks thereby; they buy them for their cheapness, in fact.

Chairman—continued.

9395. For the sake of saving a pound or two they are willing to run the risk of the introduction of disease?—Quite so.

9396. I suppose you have seen the danger of this introduction of disease, not only to the herd of the person who buys them, but to the general public, from the possibility of the disease spreading from those herds?—Quite so.

9397. Do you think that the dairymen generally would be willing to submit to any proper regulations so as to prevent the spread of disease from their dairies?—I think they would welcome them. Although they know that the effect of quarantine would be to increase the cost to some extent of the foreign animals, it would be a guarantee, to a certain extent, of their better health, and they would feel repaid for the additional cost.

9398. In fact, your association not being anxious to become the centres, or the distributors, of disease, for their own sakes, as well as for the sake of the public, would not be unprepared to see a prohibition of the introduction of these animals which are liable to disease, and they would be willing to submit to a certain amount of inspection, so as to guarantee the public that they were fairly carrying out the Order?—I believe they would.

9399. Does it appear to you that that absolute prohibition would give greater security than the original suggestion, which you placed before the Committee, of a quarantine, and allowing the animals, afterwards, to be bought in the open market?—I do not see where they would conflict.

9400. You first said that you thought your association would recommend 14 days' quarantine, and that then the animal should be able to be bought openly in the market; but you have since stated that you admit, also, that there would be considerable risk of the introduction of disease still, under those circumstances, into dairies; and, with a view of protecting both the public and the dairyman himself, you think that your association would be willing to accept the prohibition of import, with regulations guarding the public as to diseases in these dairies?—We are now under considerable regulations issued by the medical officers of health, and I presume that you only allude to the further extension of such regulations.

9401. What I meant was, that the present regulations do not allow of inspection, excepting by consent; there is no power of entry at present, and it has been represented to the Committee by one witness that, although the inspection was deemed necessary, many dairymen have refused entry to the inspector?—I have known that to be the case, because they have imagined that the inspectors would be the most likely men to introduce disease. If they believed that there would be no chance of disease being introduced into their dairies by an inspector who may have come from other dairies where the disease had been incubating, I think that there would be no objection on the part of the dairyman.

9402. If proper precautions were taken as against the disease, inspection, or power of entry to the inspector, would not, you think, be objected to by the dairymen?—Quite so.

Chairman—continued.

9403. And that inspection would ensure the public against what is suggested as a risk, that is to say, the danger of animals being infected by disease in a dairy, and the other animals in contact with them being at once sent into the market, thus spreading the germs of the disease?—Yes.

9404. Would you be in favour, if your idea of quarantine was adopted, and the store animals from abroad were still allowed to come into the country, of separating the markets of store and of fat animals?—Yes, decidedly; I think it is a most important feature that store stock and cows should be separated from the fat stock markets.

9405. I suppose that would apply generally (from your strong expression about it) to the separation between the fat and store markets, whether for foreign or home animals?—Yes, although it is more particularly directed where there is a chance of the introduction of disease; we do not think that there is the same liability to disease with home stock as there is with foreign stock.

9406. But, at the same time, looking to the fact that many people have represented, whether rightly or wrongly, that dairies in towns are the centres, the hot-beds as they have called it, of these diseases, you think the dairymen would be quite prepared to submit to any proper regulations which would clear that doubt from the public mind, and give them the security that they ask?—Quite so, to all reasonable regulations.

9407. And whilst you, on the part of the association, represent that quarantine, in your opinion, would protect you to a considerable extent from these diseases, you do not think that the trade would suffer if entire prohibition of the import of stores for dairy purposes were made the law?—If I gave an opinion upon that it must be as a personal opinion, and not as a representative.

9408. But you have already given that in evidence, because you stated that you believed that for dairy purposes the home-bred shorthorn is a more valuable animal than the Dutch or other foreign imported animal?—Quite so.

9409. And you believe also, that a foreign imported animal was not bought because he was a better animal for dairy purposes, but because he was a cheaper animal?—Quite so.

9410. And you admit that if the foreign animals are brought in, even under quarantine, there is a considerable risk of disease being introduced; and, therefore, under those circumstances, I think you stated that you thought the prohibition of the import of foreign animals would not be a serious loss or injury to the trade which you represent here?—I spoke personally then.

9411. You do not think that that is the opinion of your association?—There is a divided opinion, and it is to some extent, perhaps, complicated with what has been said about town dairies, some portion of which may be true, but some portion of which is untrue, I think, and unfair. I believe that the most prudent men do not buy foreign stock through the risk which is entailed, and their stocks are more healthy in consequence; and where that system is pursued and the cowhouses are kept according to the most approved sanitary regulation that can be enforced by the medical officers of health, the town cowhouses are as unobjectionable as a nobleman's stables; but where sometimes disease may have been introduced, as it often has, I fear, through buying these foreign stock which have been complained of, it is too often the result of poor cowkeepers having been tempted to buy those stock and put them into their places and infecting their own herds thereby; so that to a certain extent they become the very victims of the foreign breeders and salesmen who come here and complain of their dairies.

Chairman—continued.

Mr. *Tisdall.*

4 July 1877.

9412. In your opinion, as a practical man, the advantage which they suppose they derive from this attempt to get a cheaper animal really does not justify the continued risk by the import of that animal here?—I am bound to say that I do not think it does.

9413. Has the price of milk and meat risen lately?—Yes, the price of milk has risen from 20 to 25 per cent. within the last three or four years.

9414. To what do you attribute that principally?—Largely to the increased cost of cattle, and the risk of keeping them.

9415. Do you mean the risk from disease?—The risk from disease.

9416. You agree, then, with other witnesses that people have not bred animals to the same extent in consequence of that fear?—There cannot be a doubt of it.

9417. And that if they were guaranteed as they would think against a certain portion of this disease by the stoppage of the foreign import, they would return to the old system, and breed more largely?—They would; and I believe that cattle would be reduced in price.

9418. And, by breeding more largely, they would bring into the markets and into the dairies a larger number of those animals which you say are best suited to the purpose, that is to say, the English bred animal?—Quite so.

9419. With the desire that you have to prevent and get rid of these diseases would you, as a practical farmer, suggest any alteration of our existing regulations at home for the purpose of stamping out pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease, which are spread largely through the country?—I think it would be very wise if the authority could be centralised.

9420. Do you mean that uniformity of regulations should be effected by making the central authority the author of all the regulations, instead of leaving them to the different localities separately?—Quite so.

9421. Would you extend the power of the central authority to the inspection for those diseases throughout England, or would you leave that inspection with the local authorities?—I think that the power of inspection ought to be perfect.

9422. You think that, if the central authority are to regulate the whole of the country, they should themselves have the means of seeing that those regulations were carried out?—Yes.

9423. And that the appointment of the inspectors should rest, in the first instance, with the central government?—Exactly.

9424. You say that, as a practical farmer, you would be willing to submit to such regulations?—Quite so.

9425. Do you believe that the farmers and the keepers of dairies with whom you are acquainted would be willing to submit to stricter home regulations as to the movement of animals

Mr. *Tisdall.*

4 July 1877.

Chairman—continued.

for the purpose of stamping out these diseases?—I believe that they would submit to all reasonable regulations.

9426. Any reasonable regulation that had for its object the stamping out of the diseases, which you admit to be so serious in their effects upon the herds of the country, would, you think, be submitted to by the farmers and breeders?—Yes.

9427. Is there any other point that you would wish to put before the Committee?—I would simply say that in the report issued by the Veterinary Department of the Privy Council for the past year (pp. 29 to 31), I observe that there were something like 7,082 cases of foot-and-mouth disease detected at the ports by the inspectors. I believe that through the permissive state of the law those have been dealt with in every imaginable way; some have been slaughtered, and some have been allowed to pass into the country almost free; those that have herded with them unquestionably have passed into the country almost free; others have been dealt with, perhaps, by being put aside for awhile. But through the different systems of management, I submit that it is almost impossible for us to keep our home stocks free from disease whilst such a large number of imported animals, which are unquestionably affected with disease, constantly, monthly, come to our shores.

9428. And you represent that as an additional argument in favour of the unity of regulation, which would deal with all these different ports in the same way, and thus prevent many cargoes passing through the country which have been allowed hitherto to pass through the country?—Exactly. With regard to the question of town dairies, perhaps I may be permitted to introduce the report of the medical officer of health for the vestry of St. George's, Hanover-square, who said upon this subject: "Looking at the safety of young children during hot weather, we can but hope that a sufficient number of cows will be maintained for the present in town to give them milk sweet, newly milked, and that has not been much shaken. Spite of the outcry against London cowsheds, and the fact that some may have been kept unwholesomely, there is no doubt but that, on the whole, they contained better cows, better fed and better cared for, which gave better milk during the nine winter months than any like number of cows elsewhere. By all means let them be removed from streets and mews; but it is clear that they ought during hot weather to be within easy distance of the children for whom their milk is most essential." The editor of the "Medical Times and Gazette," in a note upon this, says: "We beg to re-echo these remarks. Do not keep cows in numbers in situations where they would be prejudicial to the neighbouring population; but let a good number be kept on the outskirts, and a few here and there in the more open parts of the city. The sagacious medical practioner will bear us out in saying that wherever children are to be reared there should be a cow within reach. If the place is too close for the cows it is not fit for the children."

9429. What distance are your other dairies from London, not speaking of the Kensington dairy?—Fourteen or 15 miles away; at Epsom.

9430. Do you find that the milk and cream that you send up from that dairy competes badly with the milk and cream that you produce and send from the Kensington dairy?—It is not so fresh, because the milk must be drawn from the cow in the country districts over night, so as to reach London in time for the morning consumption; so that that milk, before it reaches the tables or the nurseries, must be from 14 to 16 hours old.

Chairman—continued.

9431. Do you submit it to any process?—Yes, it must be cooled, or it would not keep for that time; but even then, in very hot weather, slight changes are observable.

9432. You are aware, of course, that a very large proportion of the milk consumed in London comes from considerable distances out of town?—The largest portion, I suppose, now does.

9433. The Aylesbury dairy, and many other dairies, supply a very large number of customers from great distances, do they not?—Yes.

9434. And it is said with very good milk; but what, I suppose, you would represent is, that the new fresh milk just from the cow is lighter and better suited for children than the milk that has been carried some distance?—Quite so; and it seems to have been the opinion of medical men.

9435. The medical man, from whose report you have read, as I understand you, speaks purely from London experience?—Quite so.

9436. When he represents the London cowsheds are better than the country cowsheds, he, probably, has never seen the number of cowsheds in the country to which he refers?—I believe that there is a feeling amongst medical men generally, that with invalids and young infants the newer and fresher the milk is that they consume the better.

9437. But you represent to the Committee that, with proper regulations, dairies can be equally as well kept in towns as they can be in the country?—Quite so.

9438. And that, therefore, if there is that advantageous property in the milk fresh from the cow, it can be obtained in that way without the dangers which, it has been suggested, attend cowsheds in towns?—Exactly.

Colonel *Kingscote.*

9439. Have you any idea what proportion of the milk supply of London comes from dairies within the metropolitan area?—I have no exact figures upon the subject, but I should presume that two-thirds is supplied from the country.

9440. One witness stated here that about 15 per cent. is supplied from the London dairies; and another person, who has not been examined here, has informed me that he could almost prove that it is only 5 per cent.; but you think it is a larger per-centage than either of those?—I should think it would be a larger proportion than 15 per cent. that is supplied by the London dairies. I know that we have 500 cows in our parish, the parish of Kensington. The number of cows in the different districts could be easily got, I think, by adding them from the medical officer's reports, but I have not seen a total; I should think that it would probably be from one-third to one-fourth.

9441. Are you a breeder of shorthorns?—I have, for the last 10 or 15 years, kept pure shorthorn bulls, and have crossed them with the best dairy cows. I have a few shorthorn cows pure bred.

Colonel *Kingscote*—continued.

9442. As a breeder, supposing you were desirous of importing fresh foreign blood from Jersey, or even from America; if you wished to do so, how would you provide in such cases against the introduction of disease?—By putting them into quarantine.

9443. You think that valuable high-bred stock could be dealt with by quarantine?—More easily than any other stock, because the slight additional expense which quarantine would entail would be less objected to in the case of high-priced stock; but in the case of low-priced stock quarantine is objected to on the ground that their price is increased by the extra expense incurred.

9444. The expense would be trifling, and easily borne, as compared with the cost of the animal?—Quite so.

Mr. *Anderson.*

9445. Did I correctly understand you to say that English shorthorn cows were good milkers?—Yes, I think that they are the best milkers.

9446. Are they better milkers than foreign cattle; better than Dutch cows, for instance?—They are.

9447. Are they better milkers than Scotch Ayrshire cows?—I would not say that they are better milkers than Scotch Ayrshires, but they are better feeders than Scotch Ayrshires. When I answered the Chairman I was speaking of cows as a whole; but English shorthorns are more profitable to keep than any other class of cattle.

9448. Taking both the milk and the flesh into consideration?—Exactly.

Mr. *Pease.*

9449. What would you say is about the quantity of milk that a good dairy cow would give between her calving and becoming dry?—It would vary according to the period that she was in milk; I have records here for the past 25 years of all my cows, and the quantities they have given; it would vary wonderfully, because some cows will perhaps be in milk for two years; and other cows would be in milk only until they were in calf again, and they might calve again within 10 months of the first; but I have known good shorthorn cows give as much as 24, or 25, or 26 quarts daily after calving; that is an enormous quantity, and that is not the average, or anything like it.

9450. That is an extraordinary case?—Yes.

9451. Have you known Dutch cows give as much milk as that?—Never.

9452. What were those cows fed on?—Grass, hay, grains, wurzel, and meal.

9453. At the present moment, supposing that you bought a foreign cow, where does it enter into your possession, as a rule?—At the Islington Market.

9454. In case of quarantine, where do you presume that it would enter into an Englishman's possession?—At the side of the river would be the proper place.

9455. And the buyer would then be responsible for the risk of the quarantine?—The seller, I presume, would be responsible.

9456. You say that an Englishman buying a foreign cow would lay it upon the bank of the river; if the cow goes into quarantine who takes it there?—The vendor would have it placed in quarantine in conjunction with the authorities at some place adjacent to the banks of the river.

9457. Are you going to buy the cow before it goes into quarantine or after it comes out?—After it comes out.

Mr. *Pease*—continued.

9458. Then you would not buy it upon the bank of the river, but as it comes out of quarantine?—As it came out of quarantine.

9459. Then, practically speaking, as the Government could not take the risk of the cow in quarantine, it would be at the vendor's risk?—I should have thought that the duty would have been assigned to the Veterinary Department of seeing that those animals should undergo a certain amount of quarantine.

Chairman.

9460. You think that the sender should maintain the animal until it had cleared the quarantine and was fit for the purchaser?—Quite so; certainly the vendor should do that under Government superintendence.

Mr. *Pease.*

9461. Then practically the cow, during the whole time that it was in quarantine, would be at the risk of the vendor, the importer?—Quite so.

9462. Do you not think that that would be a great bar to foreign speculation in milch cows?—I think it would perhaps check a great deal of the speculation that now goes on, but I think that the question for you is whether that speculation is not unfair to us at home; because it appears to me to be conducted now in such a way that it is almost impossible for us to buy cows without buying them diseased.

9463. I only want to see whether you have followed out the cost?—We know that it would increase the cost to some extent.

9464. I do not look at the cost as very material, but what do you estimate as the cost of keeping a cow 14 days in quarantine?—It would not probably make above 1 *l.* a head difference, clearing all expenses.

9465. Would not a cow be worth more, after 14 days' rest from the voyage?—I should think so.

9466. And that would be in deduction from the 1 *l.*?—Yes.

Mr. *Cameron of Lochiel.*

9467. You say that there would be a slight rise in the price of the animal in consequence of the quarantine?—Yes.

9468. I suppose that that rise in price would include the risk incurred, whether that risk was incurred by the sender or by the buyer?—It would.

9469. So that, practically, it would not make much difference whose risk it was, as the price would increase at any rate, and the buyer would have to give more than he would have to give if there was no quarantine?—That is so.

9470. With regard to the feeding of these Dutch cattle; I did not quite follow whether you fed the Dutch cow in the same way as you fed the shorthorns?—Pretty much the same.

9471. Is the expense of feeding a shorthorn any greater than the expense of feeding a Dutch cow?—There is no difference, practically.

9472. So that the advantage gained by the better supply of milk from the shorthorn is a clear gain?—Quite so; and it is a better quality of milk too.

Mr. *Tisdall.*

4 July 1877.

Mr. *Elliot.*

9473. We had a witness here who said that he thought that two months was absolutely necessary for an efficient quarantine; your opinion is that a fortnight would be sufficient, is it not?—I think that, for practical purposes, a fortnight would be sufficient.

9474. You could not ascertain in a fortnight, could you, whether an animal had pleuro-pneumonia?—No; I believe that, in some cases, pleuro-pneumonia might rest in an animal longer than a fortnight; but we are so much more fearful of the consequences of foot-and-mouth disease and of rinderpest than we are of the consequences of pleuro-pneumonia, and those two diseases are so much more infectious than pleuro-pneumonia, that, even if we occasionally had a case of pleuro-pneumonia slipped through the quarantine, and it did not show itself until afterwards, we should take precautions to put aside the animal so affected, and not expect the evil results that we should if it had been affected with either of the other diseases.

9475. Are you not more subject in dairies to pleuro-pneumonia than to foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest?—Foot-and-mouth disease is far more infectious than pleuro-pneumonia, and far more destructive.

9476. Have you more cases of it?—Sometimes there are as many cases of foot-and-mouth disease as there are of pleuro-pneumonia. If one case of foot-and-mouth disease gets into a shed it is bound to go through it; but you may have single cases of pleuro-pneumonia, and it may perhaps go no further, if you take proper care.

9477. You say that the poor dairyman buys cheap foreign animals, and that that causes a risk to the rest of his cows; why does he undergo such a risk?—I suppose his poverty, if not his will, consents.

Mr. *Elliot*—continued.

9478. Is it not because he can turn his money over more quickly by buying foreign milking cows and then selling them off for meat?—It is not so much that, I think, as the temptation to get the animal, in the first instance, cheaper; in many instances they prefer buying an animal for 15*l.* or 16*l.* to buying one that might cost them 23*l.* or 24*l.*; the temptation is too great.

9479. Is it usual for those men who buy the cheap animals to sell them off after they have stopped milking?—Yes; they would frequently get those cows into pretty good condition, and sell them off.

9480. Do they get them into better condition than when they first bought them?—They do.

9481. And therefore they get double profit, the profit as a milking cow, and the profit as a fat beast?—I very much question whether if those cows were averaged they would ever make, losses and all considered, as much as they cost.

9482. The exporter would undertake the risk and expense of quarantine; but he would be amply repaid, would he not, by the purchaser having the satisfaction of getting a good sound animal?—Quite so; it would be a guarantee.

9483. Can you give us any idea of the quantity of store cattle introduced into London in a year?—I believe that the number is small; it is 8,000 or 9,000.

9484. In your opinion the quantity is so small that we could do without it without materially interfering with the milk supply of London?—Certainly, without materially interfering with it we could.

9485. Without increasing the price of milk?—Yes.

Mr. Clare Sewell Read, a Member of the House; Examined.

Mr. *Read,* M.P.

Chairman.

9486. You have been practically acquainted with farming for many years, have you not?—All my life.

9487. You appear before this Committee, we understand, not as representing any body of farmers, but expressing your own views upon the question which is submitted to it?—I was asked by the Central Chamber of Agriculture, and also by the Farmers' Club, to represent their views here, but I said that I would rather appear as an independent witness; and as the House of Commons expressed a desire that I should be one of the Committee, I thought that it would be most respectful to this Committee to say that I should be pleased to give evidence, and I think I can do that more independently as a witness than I could if I had been on the Committee and had been a sort of judge and juror.

9488. You speak naturally, with great authority as a practical farmer, in representing your views upon this question to the Committee?—I hope so.

9489. With regard to the recent outbreak of cattle plague, have you made yourself acquainted with the facts in that case?—Perhaps the Committee would allow me to recapitulate the main facts as I think they have been produced in evidence. The cattle plague broke out beyond its accustomed limits last year. No extra, certainly

Chairman—continued.

no adequate, precautions were taken to prevent its introduction into this country, but when it did come the Privy Council issued orders prohibiting the importation not only of cattle, but of dead meat, which latter prohibition, I think, was perfectly unnecessary. The "Castor" came into the Thames, and drovers and Custom House officers went on board the ship, and left her when she came to Deptford. At Deptford one bullock was so diseased with cattle plague that it died on the landing-stage, and it was not until the evening of that day that cattle plague was detected. The majority of those cattle were kept alive, some of them as long as eight days, manufacturing a sufficient quantity of cattle plague virus to poison the whole country. The vessel leaves Deptford without being disinfected; people go off and on as if nothing had happened; the vessel is not disinfected until the conclusion of four days; the cattle plague breaks out at Limehouse, and it is soon evident that the local authorities cannot cope with it; but it takes three months of deputations from Chambers of Agriculture, from the Farmers' Clubs, from Quarter Sessions, from County Committees, and from independent Members of Parliament, before the Privy Council will exercise the powers that were given them by the Act of 1869.

9490. You

Chairman—continued.

9490. You mean those powers which assumed to the Privy Council the full authority to treat the complaint?—Yes, and which they did exercise successfully, I might say, after the cattle plague had been here for three months.

9491. That hesitation, I imagine, probably arose from some little dread of interfering with the local institutions and authorities?—I think that the Privy Council are generally fearful of somebody or something.

9492. What I meant by my question was, that so long as local authorities are empowered and remain under the Act able to deal with these diseases until a malady of this kind comes to our shores, the only power of the Privy Council being to interfere with them when necessity arises, there will always be a liability, will there not, to this hesitation on the part of the central authority, from a dread of the objections that are always made to any interference with local working?—No doubt there will be that fear and that dread. In this case I consider that great necessity arose for immediate action.

9493. All this points rather to the necessity of an alteration in our existing system rather than to any very great dereliction of duty in this particular instance on the part of the central authority?—I think that, having tried the permissive powers of the Privy Council, you should go further, and have an Act making it compulsory that in all future cases of an outbreak of cattle plague, the Privy Council should at once step in, supersede the local authority, slaughter all the cattle, and pay compensation in this case out of the Consolidated Fund.

9494. But under the existing state of things, in which the authority rests with the locality, the Privy Council only stepping in and interfering with that authority when the cattle plague becomes an established fact, much of the hesitation on the part of the Privy Council, and many of the objections against the action of the Privy Council, are not so strong when they are looked at in that light, are they?—I think it was an established fact that the cattle plague had broken out in Limehouse, and it is always better to extinguish a fire when the first spark rises.

9495. You have recapitulated the history of the outbreak and the action taken, and you stated that the "Castor" was allowed to go away before she was disinfected; but that was before the Privy Council were really aware of the introduction of the disease at all, was it not?—Then that shows a fault somewhere; for if an animal is so far advanced in cattle plague that it dies on the landing place, there must have been ignorance or negligence on the part of the inspectors in not detecting it before.

9496. You think that the inspectors, both abroad and in England, are really to blame in this instance?—Yes, and the Privy Council is to blame for placing so much reliance upon inspection, which has been proved over and over again to be perfectly useless and futile.

9497. You think that the system of relying, as we do at the present moment, upon local inspection is faulty?—Either local or Governmental inspection I consider is unreliable.

9498. In case of a fresh outbreak, would you recommend that the Privy Council should assume the authority immediately on being apprised, either by telegraph or otherwise, of the outbreak?—Certainly.

Chairman—continued.

9499. Putting the powers that they have in force instantly, and setting aside the local jurisdiction?—Yes. I would also add that in this case I would have compensation paid out of the Consolidated Fund.

9500. Would you make that compensation to the full value of the animal destroyed, or would you leave it at the present rate?—I think you might give, as at present, half the value of animals that are attacked with cattle plague, but certainly the full value for all animals slaughtered that are associated with them.

9501. That is with regard to cattle plague; but, dealing with pleuro-pneumonia, we had a number of recommendations made to us by the committee of which you were a member in 1873?—Yes; there were four recommendations made by that Select Committee. The first was that we should kill all animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia; that was put in force at once. The second was that compensation should be raised from half the value to three-fourths of the loss; that was not done, I believe, until this year, and then, instead of making it compulsory upon the local authorities to do that, it was still left permissive. The third was that it should be extended to Ireland; that was not done until the passing of the Irish Act of last year, which did not come into operation, I believe, until the 14th of February of this year. The fourth was that we should have an isolation of the infected herds for two months instead of for 28 days; that has not been done at present. Then there was a fifth recommendation, which was lost by a majority of one, which suggested that all cattle coming from foreign countries where pleuro-pneumonia existed should, in the case of store stock, be subjected to a quarantine, or in the case of fat stock be killed at the port of debarkation. I may say that in the case of Holland, whence we get most of our cows, the average number of cases of pleuro-pneumonia has been from 2,000 to 6,000 a year in cattle amounting to only 1,500,000 in number, which is the whole stock of cattle of Holland. They were only subjected until last February to a 12 hours' quarantine. They have since then been sent to Deptford, and several cases of pleuro-pneumonia have been found in cargoes imported from Holland, and one only, I think last Monday week, a few days after I attended the market there.

9502. Can you state what the amount of our import of store animals from those countries is?—No; I do not think that anybody knows, because there is no division; but I should think that the quantity of foreign cows that come in for milking purposes varies from 5,000 to 10,000; it is not much more than that. I have not seen a store foreign animal in the country for some years now.

9503. And the number which are brought over principally for dairy purposes are, you represent, very liable to disease?—Certainly.

9504. Until the recent regulations with regard to cattle plague, had they any restrictions imposed upon them?—Not sufficient restrictions.

9505. Do you believe that the import of store animals for these purposes into this country is necessary?—I do not think that it is necessary, but I should not entirely prohibit it.

9506. You heard what the last witness said, I think, with regard to their use in the dairies of the town?—Yes.

Mr. *Read*, M.P.

4 July 1877.

Chairman—continued.

9507. Looking to what he stated, you would not think that, if the import of those cows was a necessity for the trade, the danger would be so great that it might be wise to stop them; but you think that they ought to be allowed to come in under certain regulations?—I think that the difficulties in the way of quarantining a few cows has been much exaggerated. I would take some port like Harwich, not anywhere near the river side here, and make that a quarantine station. I would have the cows there for 14 days, and at the expiration of 14 days, they should be branded; and the dairies to which they went should be subject to inspection for the next two months.

9508. The 14 days' quarantine would not, I presume, be a sufficient guarantee against the introduction of pleuro-pneumonia, for instance?—Certainly not; but I think it would be long enough to prevent the introduction of cattle plague and foot-and-mouth disease.

9509. You think that you could meet the difficulty of their introducing pleuro-pneumonia into the dairies by a system of inspection or supervision over the dairy of the man who bought them, until a period of two months had elapsed?—I should hope that in a few months we shall extend the period of isolation for pleuro-pneumonia from 28 days to two months, so that you would simply say that that dairy into which those foreign cows are admitted is an infected place.

9510. I suppose that the principle of the dairy herd is rather the constant flow of animals through the dairy; they are constantly buying?—Yes.

9511. Then, if they bought an animal from abroad and took it into their dairy, if that dairy had to be considered an infected place for two months afterwards, that would very much interfere with the constant purchasing of animals which are necessary for their business, would it not?—No more than it does with the farmer who wants to sell his stock, if they are to be locked up for two months as being suspected.

9512. But, practically, it would almost destroy the trade in those foreign animals if they were surrounded by all these precautions, would it not?—I do not think it would. It would get rid of a great number of suspicious animals, and perhaps of some of the cheaper ones. The better ones would come, and I believe that 1 *l.* a-head would amply pay the cost of quarantine for 14 days. Then I would observe that the dairy would be no worse off than if there had been a case of pleuro-pneumonia, and there are so many cases of pleuro-pneumonia in the dairies of London, that it would not be a very exceptional case.

9513. From your experience do you think that the Dutch cow is necessary for the supply of milk from those dairies, or that her loss can be met by the short-horn supply?—I think that you would do better to trust to the home supply; but, at the same time, there are a great many people who cannot afford to buy the short-horns, and they buy the Dutch cows.

9514. With proper precautions, you think that they might be admitted without danger?—I will not say without danger, but with great mitigation of the present danger.

9515. With regard to the question of our supplies, it has been stated in evidence before this Committee that the dead meat has been gradually

Chairman—continued.

increasing in quantity as against the live animals in the market; what is your view upon that subject?—I believe it would be safest and best to rely entirely upon a dead-meat supply, and I believe that in future, and in no very distant future, that will be the case; but, at the same time, I do not think that the country is prepared for it, and I do not think that we have facilities sufficiently developed at present to rely upon that entirely.

9516. I suppose you would represent that the dead-meat trade, which you think is the safest, and at the same time the best supply, will work its own way and become a trade, which will itself put a stop to the live import by degrees?—I think it will by degrees, and eventually.

9517. In the interval before that takes place, what would you suggest to the Committee with regard to our foreign import?—I had the honour of serving on the Cattle Plague Commission of 1865, and with the permission of this Committee, I will just refer to the names of the members of whom it was composed: Lord Spencer, Lord Cranborne, Mr. Lowe, Dr. Lyon Playfair, Mr. John Robinson Maclean (who, I think, represented Staffordshire), Dr. Bence Jones, Dr. Quain, and Dr. Parkes (all eminent medical men), Mr. Seeley and Mr. Spooner (representing the veterinary profession), and myself. We passed an unanimous resolution in our second Report, which I will read. "To restrict importation absolutely to certain ports; to cause all fat cattle to be slaughtered at those ports, and all store cattle to undergo a period of quarantine; hides and skins, not salted, to be disinfected at the ports of importation." That resolution was passed on the 5th of February 1866. I have advocated that ever since, and I advocate it most strongly now.

9518. You think that in fact all foreign animals should, for the purpose of protecting the country against these diseases, be slaughtered at the port of debarkation?—I think so.

9519. Do you include sheep and pigs in the word "cattle"?—Most entirely; sheep bring us sheep-pox, and the imports from the Continent are almost all more or less infected with scab.

9520. I suppose that the trade is a very large one in the small German sheep?—Yes.

9521. And you would require all those, as well as the cattle, to be slaughtered at the port of landing?—Most assuredly, and I also would put the American cattle there too, and the Spanish and the Danish cattle, although they may be perfectly healthy. The truth of it is, that when you come into the stream of cattle importation, however healthy your animals may be, if they cross it even, in any way, they are very likely to become diseased.

9522. I presume that you would have a separate market established for all foreign stock?—I would.

9523. It has been stated in evidence here that that would do away in a great measure with the objections which are at present raised to the Deptford and other dead meat markets, because it would put into those markets a continuous stream of supply, which would bring to it the competition which is now wanted; and thus the difficulty which has been suggested of our losing the trade would be got over; do you concur in that view?—Yes. Perhaps you will allow me to say

Chairman—continued.

say one word about the Deptford Market. In the first place, when it was established, you doubled the tolls on the home market. You really have at Deptford no Market day at all, because it is on the same day as the Metropolitan Cattle Market at Islington. In consequence, the salesmen have to run about from one market to another, and, generally speaking, foreigners are not attended to properly at the Deptford Market. Then you have a most fluctuating supply, and you have this very considerable drawback, that whereas a cargo of cattle may be landed on the north side of the Thames, and the last bullock that comes out may be affected with some sort of disease you have to reload the whole of them and send them off to the Deptford Market; and consequently an importer is never certain as to where his cattle will go, or to what market they will come. I think that Deptford is a very out-of-the-way place, because there is no rail, and the paving and the drainage are both bad; they have no adequate means of disposing of the carcases of diseased animals, and there is no proper mode of disinfecting people going out and in that I can see.

9524. You say this from having personally inspected the market?—Yes; I have been there several times; I was there last Thursday. On the other hand, I may say, that it is a very roomy, and very airy, and wonderfully well-managed place; and although I heard Mr. Giblett, I think, say that nothing would induce certain people to go down there even in a carriage and pair, I was very happy to go down in a second-class railway carriage, and I had a pleasant morning. It was said that there is no business going on there, but I found no less than 34 slaughter-houses in full employ, and they are building more, and although it is so out of the way, and has no rail accommodation. I saw sheep there which were being killed in the early morning, and which I was informed would be taken by vans to the railway station, and be in Birmingham and Manchester butchers' shops at six o'clock that evening. I saw only one single case of foot-and-mouth disease out of the whole of the many animals that were there all over that market, and that happened to be a Danish bullock. Those Danish cattle are supposed to be very healthy, but the truth of it is this: they are sent to the Metropolitan Market, and a great number of them are bought by men who have slaughter-houses at Deptford; consequently, they are taken into the Metropolitan Market, and driven eight or nine miles back to Deptford and there slaughtered, although you hear it said that cattle will not go there, even if they are forced in, and that it would destroy the foreign trade in cattle. I may, perhaps, be also allowed to say that, notwithstanding the bad management in the case of cattle plague at Deptford, I believe that the plague did not break out from the market, but was carried from the ship to Limehouse.

9525. That is to say that the precautions taken by the Privy Council of declaring the place, as soon as the cattle got there, an infected place, and disinfecting everyone who went in and out, prevented the spread of disease from Deptford; and it was simply because they had no control over the vessel that the disease spread?—My opinion upon that point is, of course, valueless, but I give it as my opinion. With regard to Hull, we had evidence before the last Committee as to its want of proper isolation from other markets; and I understood Professor Brown to say that, notwithstanding all that they had insisted upon, they still could not get the Hull authorities to carry out all the recommendations.

Chairman—continued.

9526. Did you hear the Hull witness on Monday?—I did not.

9527. The honourable Member for Hull, elicited in evidence before the Committee, that the authorities in Hull were prepared now to carry out the recommendations of the Privy Council, and to establish an entirely separate market for the home stock?—So they said before, and so they will say again, unless some one makes them do it.

9528. And that it was to be opened next week?—I am very glad to hear it. But if the authorities at Hull allow the fodder and the litter from foreign animals to go into the Hull cow-houses, we shall be no better off than we are now.

9529. You refer to the purchasing of extra forage from the vessels when they bring in the animals?—Yes; that seems to be a common practice.

9530. From your experience of the Deptford Market, you believe, first of all, that the bringing of a certain trade there will get over the difficulties that are at present suggested, and will, therefore, make it a success, and not drive away the foreigners from the place; and you believe also, as I understand you, that the supply of our towns with dead meat from Deptford is possible, because it is going on at the present moment?—Yes; it is possible now, and it would be very easy if they had a tramway or some railway communication to the market.

9531. And, with the additional facilities which a regular trade would probably bring into existence, you think that the supply of dead meat to the towns would become a very large one?—Very large.

9532. And since that trade does now exist during the hot weather, and is carried on as a remunerative trade, it cannot be subject to the inconveniences and loss that have been suggested with regard to it?—No.

9533. With regard to the fat and store stock markets, have you considered that question?—I agree with the last witness, that it is very desirable, whenever you can do so, to separate fat markets from store markets. In the country I do not think it is possible, but in a place like London you certainly ought to have a separate market; or rather, any animal that went into the Islington Market should never be allowed to be shown in any other market.

9534. Would you brand them when they came into the Islington Market, and allow them simply to have it for the purpose of slaughter?—Yes; I would brand them, or cut the hair off their tails, or do something of that sort.

9535. They are so marked at the present moment, are they not?—Yes; but, generally speaking, there is no restriction against their being sent to any other market.

9536. You think that it would not be necessary to keep a cordon round London, but merely under heavy penalties to forbid an animal branded in a particular way from being exposed in any other market?—Yes; they should be taken direct to the slaughter-houses where they were required.

Mr. *Read*, M.P.

4 July 1877.

Chairman—continued.

9537. It was suggested by one witness, Mr. Gebhardt, that that should be carried out with full permission to take them for slaughter to any part of England; do you see any risk of the evasion of the law in that way?—Not unless there is disease in the country or in the vicinity of the market.

9538. Whilst limiting it to be a market for fat animals, you would allow of their being taken for slaughter purposes properly marked to any part of England?—Yes. I was at the Metropolitan Cattle Market last Thursday, and I saw the worst diseased bullock in that market that I ever saw in my life.

9539. Was that pleuro-pneumonia or foot-and-mouth disease?—It was no acute disease, or else the thing must have died ages ago; but it was the most emaciated and the most disgraceful bullock to be exhibited in a market for human food that I ever saw. It was really so bad that I could not tell what nationality it belonged to. I rather think it was a Welsh bullock. It was not an Irish one; it was a black with a little white on it.

9540. But I suppose you represent to the Committee, that the lairs of the Islington Market are so liable to disease themselves that that is one of your reasons for saying that the market should be simply a slaughter market?—Certainly; and I would say that we can frequently trace the introduction of foot-and-mouth disease into Norfolk, to stock that have come out of the Metropolitan Market. Mr. Inspector Smith told me, that out of the eight recent outbreaks that we have had in Norfolk he could trace five or six directly to the Metropolitan Market.

9541. Do you mean home animals that had been bought in the Islington Market?—Yes, and that had been sent into the country.

Mr. *Pease.*

9542. To feed again?—To feed again, most probably; or else they have been exhibited in another market after having been exposed in the Metropolitan Market.

Chairman.

9543. The great danger is of the jobber, seeing his opportunity of making an additional shilling in another market, buying the animal in a slack trade at Islington, and taking it down to the other market?—Yes.

9544. You have of course given a good deal of attention to this dead meat trade, which has been recently attempted from America?—Yes, I have seen a good deal of it.

9545. Have you seen it at the ports where it has been introduced?—No, I have never seen it at the ports, but I have seen it in different towns in England. I saw some of it last Wednesday in the Metropolitan Market when I think the thermometer was at 80 degrees in the shade, and it was in very good order indeed.

9546. Had that been brought from Liverpool?—That had been brought from Liverpool. I was told that it was first put into a barge from the ship and then put on to the railway, without any precautions being taken to keep it cool, and there it was in very good order; but, like all other dead meat that has been kept for some days, it has a certain unsightly and tarnished appearance which is entirely confined to the outside. With

Chairman—continued.

regard to the American supply, I believe the Americans do not slaughter their cattle in the same way as we do. Instead of knocking them on the head, they hang them up by their hind legs and cut their throats; and the consequence is that there is a quantity of extravasated blood all round the shin of the bullock, which gives it a very unsightly appearance in the carcase.

9547. That arises from the mode of slaughtering?—That arises from the mode of slaughtering.

9548. Have you seen very much of this American dead meat which has been described as having come into the London market in bad condition?—I saw some of it in bad condition. It seems to me that there are two processes which are adopted: one which is successful and which keeps the air not only cool but dry, and the other which keeps it cool and damp; and the meat which is brought by the latter process is in a very nasty disgusting state.

9549. Then you represent that it is the fault of the machinery by which it is brought over and not from the difficulty of bringing it over that we suffer, where it is condemned?—From that and from the accident of not having any ice, or from the machinery breaking down, or from something of that sort.

9550. But there is nothing in it to interfere with a regular trade being established, if it is worth their while to do so?—No, not even in the hottest weather, I should say. But you will never perfect any meat trade with America unless you get cool stores here. I consider that that is an essential part of a dead-meat trade. You get the market so very much glutted at one time that, if you have not a place to keep this extra quantity of meat in, the trade will be most fitful.

9551. But the system of having cool stores is a system which is beginning to develop itself, and, of course, with an established trade, it will form a necessary part of that trade?—Yes; there is a so-called cold store under the Cannon-street Station, but it simply means that there is naturally cool air in those arches; there has been no attempt to cool the atmosphere. But they are now building some very large stores there, which I should think would contain an enormous quantity of meat.

9552. And in which the process is to be adopted for really maintaining the temperature at the proper height?—Yes; they were preparing machinery the other day when I was there.

9553. There is nothing, of course, that will prevent that being done in every port in England?—Nothing. With regard to butchering, I would say that there has not been the slightest improvement in it since I was a boy; it is just as rude, and rough and ready, as it was then; and when you talk about farmers not taking any leaf out of scientific books or discoveries, butchers have done nothing towards reducing the animal heat in the carcase of a bullock when it is killed, and I think that that is a thing which ought to be attended to.

9554. That is a system which they adopt in America, in order to prepare the meat before bringing it over for a voyage of that length?—Just so; and when once you expel the animal heat from the carcase of a bullock, I believe that it will keep very much longer than the fresh meat that is killed here in England.

9555. You

Chairman—continued.

9555. You agree with the American evidence, and with the witnesses from Liverpool, who state that that is the result of their experience of it?—Yes.

9556. Then, I suppose, you believe that this trade will become a permanent source of supply to this country, as soon as the difficulties or the uncertainties which at present attend it have been overcome?—I do, notwithstanding the opinion that is generally expressed by cattle importers and salesmen, that it will very soon die a natural death. I may also say that I have heard the men who are selling the American meat say that they believe the imports of American live animals will very soon cease; I think that in all probability they will both go on.

9557. The import of American live animals is limited, practically, to a certain number of months in the year in which they are sure of very fine weather, is it not?—Yes; and there is a very large expenditure of 7 *l.* or 8 *l.* on each animal. I may say that I saw some capital American bullocks in the Metropolitan Market last Thursday, and they seemed to have stood the journey remarkably well.

9558. But you think that the dead-meat trade, when once it is an established fact, will, from its cheapness, and from its being consequently more remunerative, supersede that American live cattle trade?—I do not know that it will supersede it entirely, unless people become less prejudiced than they are at present against the dead meat. With regard to that prejudice, I would say that it is marvellous to me that the Government should encourage it. Even at the Naval and Military Depôt that they have at Deptford, quite close to the Cattle Market, they insist upon having live animals, when they could get dead meat within a few hundred yards.

9559. Are you aware that that restriction, which I believe has existed up to very recently, has been relaxed, and that Government contracts for dead meat have been made within the last few weeks?—I am very glad to hear it; it shows that the Government officials are improving.

9560. A Government contract has been made even within the last few weeks for American dead meat?—I am very glad to hear it.

9561. Have you any experience of the dead-meat trade in your own county of Norfolk?—A few years ago it was very small. Now the Great Eastern Railway take about 5,000 tons a year to the Metropolitan Market. I will also illustrate it in another way. When the excessive restrictions were put upon the Metropolitan Market, so that no cattle could leave that market alive, Mr. Le Neve, a large dealer and salesman in Norfolk, had lost so much money by certain cattle that he had brought to the Metropolitan Market that he determined to slaughter in Norfolk; he hired a railway shed at Wrexham station, and since then he has killed on an average 50 cattle a week and sent them dead to the Metropolitan Market. He continues to do so, and all through this hot weather he has not lost a pound of meat. He sends the offal as well as the carcase of the bullock to London, and the only thing that he objects to is the cost of the carriage. He says that the Great Eastern charge him 50 *s.* per ton for the meat, and they charge him 12 *s.* 6 *d.* per head on the live animals, which, I believe, is something like half as much again for the dead weight as against the live weight. I think that they can put on a truck five tons of dead meat, which would be 12 *l.* 10 *s.*, and they can get only eight bullocks into a similar sized truck, and they charge for those bullocks 12 *s.* 6 *d.* per head; which would be 5 *l.*

Chairman—continued.

9562. But the principal fact that it represents is, that the meat has been now for some time slaughtered in Norfolk, and finds a ready sale in the London market?—It does, without losing anything. This slaughter-house at Wrexham is about 10 miles to the north of Norwich, and I have known this gentleman buy stock 30 miles south of Norwich, take them back to his slaughter-house, kill them there, and send them dead to London.

9563. Is he also able to dispose of the offal in the London market in the same way as he does of the dead meat?—He has had no loss. I would also say that there is a small butcher in my immediate neighbourhood who kills 10 or 15 a week and sends them up to London; he is 12 miles from Norwich and four miles from a station at Dereham. I said to him the other day: "I suppose that in the hot weather you do not send the meat to London, but you take it to Norwich, which is much nearer?" and he told me this: "I can do better in the hot weather by sending it to the London market. I kill at night, send it up from Dereham by the late train, and it arrives in the Metropolitan Market early the next morning."

9564. And he prefers sending them to London, notwithstanding the distance, to selling them in the town close by?—He does; it is 120 miles by rail.

9565. Does he deal with the offal of those animals?—He sends some to Norwich and some to London. He is entirely what we call a wholesale butcher, although it is in a small line. He is a carcase butcher, which is a trade which is very much developing, because even when you take the meat to the Norwich market (and it is more marked, of course, in a great city like London), you have one butcher that requires one portion of the bullock and another who wants another portion; he does not want the whole of the animal; it does not suit his customers.

9566. And those two examples confirm the evidence that was given here by a witness on Monday as to the possibility of dealing with dead meat and sending it long distances from the place where it is slaughtered, for consumption and for competition with the live animals killed on the spot?—Just so.

9567. I think I understood you to say in almost the first answer that you gave, that you thought that it was great folly to trust to inspection for the prevention of diseases; have you considered the altered circumstances that are suggested to us by the foreign witnesses, Professor Müller and others, who have suggested that the governments abroad are prepared to establish very stringent regulations in addition to those that exist, which would result, as they say, in our protection?—The folly of trusting to inspection to discover diseases whose incubation varies from two days to three months, I think, must be patent to everybody; but when you come to the German promises, I would say that we had exactly similar evidence as to what the German Government were going to do before the Cattle Plague Commission of 1865, and, with your permission, I will read you what the Commissioners

Mr. *Read*, M.P.

4 July 1877.

Chairman—continued.

missioners said then: "Against the peril which must lurk in these great importations, inspection will always be a very imperfect defence. It is proved that there was no sort of knowledge where cattle came from;" and they further added: "It is useless to trust to any inspection or precautionary measures of foreign governments for cattle leaving their own ports, or in case of through traffic."

9568. That was from the evidence which you took in 1865?—Yes. Then I may say that it will be remembered that we had pretty well the same thing said before the Committee of 1873. Dr. Williams was very hopeful that by means of improved telegraphic communication and consular intelligence we should hear of these outbreaks.

9569. There was a meeting of the veterinary departments of the different countries subsequently to that, for the purpose of arranging international communication, was there not?—I believe there was; and I may add that, notwithstanding all these facilities and improvements, I believe the Right honourable gentleman, the Member for Bradford, in the year 1872, told the German Government that they would have the cattle plague; and if our inspectors here had been wide awake at Deptford this year, they might have told them the same thing before they told us that they had sent it to England.

9570. You mean that the inspection abroad, up to the present time, has been so lax that they are not officially aware of the existence of the disease before we should be able to tell them of its importation into this country?—Quite so. With regard to the case of Hamburg, where the "Castor" came from, I hear many people say: "Oh, there are only one or two diseased cattle in a cargo, and you slaughter the whole." I find in the official Return that from Hamburg alone we received, in the year 1876, no less than 1,656 diseased animals, and it is idle to suppose but that some of them must have shown symptoms of disease on the other side of the water; it could not all have been developed *in transitu*.

9571. You think that the inspection was so lax that they were not certified as diseased when they ought to have been so certified?—Quite so. I believe it was given in evidence here that importers very frequently employ their own inspectors, who separate the pronouncedly diseased animals from the infected animals, and send us the infected animals in which the disease is as yet undeveloped, and keep the diseased animals at home. In that way they follow the advice of Professor Fergusson, who told the Irish farmers that, when any foot-and-mouth disease broke out upon their farms, the best thing was to keep the diseased animals at home, and send the others to market.

9572. When was that?—Two years ago.

9573. Was that publicly stated?—It was publicly stated, certainly.

9574. Then, as I understand you to say, it is the laxity of inspection at Hamburg which led to the import of disease in the present instance, a laxity which you represent has always existed; but now the witnesses from Germany have stated here that they have already taken certain precautions; that the Government there, being as much interested in the prevention of the introduction of this disease into Germany as we can be in preventing its being introduced here, have established a zone around their frontier over which cattle must travel, subject to inspection; that they are prepared to alter their telegraphic communication so as to give us readier intelligence of an outbreak; and that they are prepared at once, on the first discovery of it there, to stop all those markets from which we are liable to get disease; will not those additional precautions alter the condition of things?—I do not think they will do so; I should not trust them, certainly, because we have had similar promises (though not so complete) for the last 10 or 12 years. The Privy Council are supposed to know officially of the existence of disease all over the Continent. In the year 1875 the Veterinary Department of the Privy Council does not report any foot-and-mouth disease in Holland or in Belgium. We imported in that year 342 animals affected with foot-and-mouth disease from Belgium, and 418 from Holland. Although the Privy Council are supposed to know all about it, yet in their Reports they say they heard nothing of it officially.

9575. You mean that the animals were stopped here on landing, suffering from that disease?—From foot-and-mouth disease.

9576. And you believe that those animals were diseased animals when they started, and that the hardships of the voyage had not produced the disease?—They must have caught the contagion on the other side of the water.

9577. Upon those grounds, you would recommend slaughter at the port of debarkation?—Yes, but I would go beyond that in one sense, and that is, that in all these cases where you have the chance of getting cattle plague, I would not allow the cattle to come in at all.

9578. From a country like Russia, from which you are always liable to the introduction of cattle plague, you think that the entire trade should be prohibited?—Yes; and I would go beyond that, and say, that from those countries through which animals from infected countries pass, import should be prohibited.

9579. Then, do you agree with Professor Brown, in recommending, as he has done, that, if we adopt additional restrictions, the German and Belgian cattle should be prohibited, on account of the one country being liable to disease, and of the other being a transit country for it?—I am very happy to agree with Professor Brown for once.

2580. To go back to Norfolk, have you had much pleuro-pneumonia in Norfolk?—Yes; I wish just to place before the Committee a few facts relative to the experiment with regard to stamping out pleuro-pneumonia by the slaughter of animals that has been made during the last four years, imperfect and incomplete as it is. In the year previous to that commencing at Michaelmas 1873, when the slaughtering powers came into operation, we had no less than 1,722 cattle affected with pleuro-pneumonia in Norfolk. Since then, although there has been no considerable diminution, it is rather a hopeful experiment, I think, on the whole. In the next year we had 960; in the next, 692; in the third, 580; and in the year ending last Saturday we had 449.

9581. That is a steady diminution of the number of animals affected?—Yes. I would also say that the last two quarters are rather hopeful, for in the last two quarters only 174 were slaughtered for disease.

Chairman—continued.

9582. Would you tell the Committee what the process has been by which this steady diminution of disease has been arrived at; have you inoculated for the disease?—No; we have simply carried out the existing orders of the Privy Council, I believe, as strictly as any county in England. We have isolated the cattle for 28 days, and whenever an owner does not give proper notice of the outbreak of the disease, or whenever he does not carry out the orders of the local authority strictly, we do not allow him any compensation. Would you allow me to say that there have been 2,404 cattle killed by the local authority in those four years, the value of them being 32,280 *l.*; the salvage that we have made has been 16,040 *l.*, and the compensation paid to owners has been 11,105 *l.*, being one-half of the loss. I would particularly impress upon the Irish Members this amount of salvage of no less than 16,000 *l.* worth of really very good meat, because I believe that in Ireland it is the practice to bury all animals that are slaughtered with pleuro-pneumonia, and that I consider to be a wicked waste of good food.

9583. Do you mean animals that were absolutely affected with disease, or animals that had been killed because they happened to have been in contact with diseased animals?—We do not kill any animals that have been in contact with diseased animals; but I mean to say that the meat of an animal in the first stage of pleuro-pneumonia is no worse meat than that of an animal affected with foot-and-mouth disease; and I should also say that the meat would be more wholesome than that of some healthy cattle that are killed in London after they have gone through all the miseries of a long sea voyage, or even of a long railway journey, in England.

Mr. *King Harman.*

9584. You are, perhaps, not aware that cattle slaughtered in Ireland in the first stage of pleuro-pneumonia are not necessarily buried, but are sometimes sent to the butchers?—I read from the account of the Dublin authority. There is a great conflict now going on between the local authority and the inspector of the markets: he will not allow any cattle that have been killed for pleuro-pneumonia to be sold for dead meat.

Chairman.

9585. And what you represent is, that that is not necessary either for the health of the people or to prevent the spread of disease?—No; I think, with regard to the spread of pleuro-pneumonia, it is only by the direct contact of one living animal with another that you can communicate the disease.

9586. In that case, clearly, as long as it is sufficiently healthy for food, it is a great waste of food to destroy it?—Yes. Mr. Inspector Smith told me that he had condemned two bullocks within the last few days, and one of them was sold for 29 *l.* and the other for 30 *l.*

9587. And that salvage in Norfolk goes a long way towards recouping the amount paid to the owner?—Instead of costing the county 11,000 *l.*, if we had made no salvage it would have cost us 27,000 *l.*

9588. I understand you to say that you have accomplished this reduction in the number of cases of disease in Norfolk by adopting, in the strictest way, the existing regulations of the Privy Council?—Yes.

Chairman—continued.

9589. But I understood you to state before that you think that those regulations ought to be very much strengthened?—I do.

9590. Do you think that they should be strengthened in regard to the time for which places should be considered as infected districts, and that they should be made obligatory as from the central authority?—Especially with regard to compensation, and also with regard to the extension to Ireland.

9591. Would you treat Ireland, then, as part of Great Britain?—Certainly.

9592. And would you make the same regulations that you suggest for this country applicable to Ireland also?—Certainly.

9593. In that way the whole kingdom would be treated as one country, and the same methods for stamping out the disease would affect both islands?—Yes. It was said sometime ago that this could not be done in Ireland, but as soon as ever a motion was put down on the paper of the House of Commons to bring it before the notice of the House, a Bill was introduced into the House of Lords, which became law last year, and which I think came into operation on the 14th of February this year. It was said by Professor Fergusson that there was very little pleura-pneumonia in Ireland; and, in the year 1875, according to the returns, the number of all the cattle that were killed in Ireland for pleuro-pneumonia was 281. I ventured to say in the House, that I thought that if you compensated the owner, the probability was that more than 281 cases would be found in Dublin alone. I now see that in one union, the North Dublin Union, where I suppose most of the cows are, 240 cows have been killed.

9594. Is this subsequent to any change as to the compensation?—Since compensation has been paid, and that, I believe, is paid very indifferently in consequence of the conflict between the authorities and the difficulty of getting money. But in the North Dublin Union alone, from the 24th of February to the 23rd of June, about four months, there have been already 240 cows killed.

9595. And that very much confirms the opinion which you expressed before?—It does. I may also say that I hear on good authority that there is pleura-pneumonia prevalent in Mallow, in the county of Cork; two or three infected districts in Limerick; Thurles, in Tipperary; Newry, the County of Louth; King's County, Derry; and in several other neighbourhoods, which my correspondent fails to remember just then; but he adds that Dublin is the great centre of infection.

9596. I suppose, therefore, that Ireland is affected with pleuro-pneumonia, as England is very generally at the present moment?—Not in anything like the degree that some parts of England are, and certainly not to the degree that we are infected in Norfolk. If they were as bad as we are, the whole of the stock of England might be killed by the importations of stock from Ireland.

9597. If you believe that by proper regulations you may stamp it out in England, would not the same system of regulations affect its eradication from Ireland also?—Yes; they ought

Mr. *Read*, M.P.

4 July 1877.

Chairman—continued.

to be more particular in Ireland than we are here, for this reason: that whereas a cow, if she went to graze in the meadows in Ireland, would perhaps only affect another cow; if she was put into a ship and sent over with 300 or 400 cattle, she would have the chance of inoculating a great portion of the cargo, making, perhaps, 50 or 60 new centres of disease in England.

9598. You have been mentioning this experience with regard to pleuro-pneumonia in Norfolk; have you any facts to give with regard to foot-and-mouth disease also in that county?—None whatever; we have no foot-and-mouth disease now, I am happy to say, and we have had but very few outbreaks within the last ten months.

9599. Have you any reason to attribute that to any particular cause?—We employ all the powers that the Privy Council give us with regard to the strict isolation of not only all cattle affected with foot-and-mouth disease, but of all those that have been herded with them.

9600. And the regulations which you have strictly enforced have practically prevented any outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Norfolk?—I would not say that, because I think that something else has to do with it besides our restrictions; I believe that foot-and-mouth disease is the most perishable of all the diseases that we have, although it is the most subtle in its contagion.

9601. The virus does not last a very long time?—The virus does not last very long; and I have generally noticed that when we have a fresh import and outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease it is very virulent, and that after a time it becomes less so. In some cases it is so slight that people do not seem to mind much about it.

9602. It dies out?—It dies out; it has died out I believe in America, and I believe it would die out here if we had no fresh importations. I do not believe in the naturalization of these diseases

9603. You think that, with proper restrictions, you would be really able therefore to ensure its dying away out of the country?—I think that we should eventually get rid of it; I am not so sanguine as some of the witnesses who say that you might get rid of it entirely in a few months, but I should hope that in a few years you might get rid of pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease altogether.

9604. Do you think that the farmers of England would be willing to submit to the regulations which you have suggested, even stricter than those which you have enforced in Norfolk?—If they were certain that they would be protected against the re-introduction of foreign diseases I have no doubt that they would, and I say that in flat contradiction to the testimony of Professor Brown; I believe that on that point I may be considered as good an authority as Professor Brown. The truth of it is, that the farmers do not believe in the efficacy of the restrictions that are now in force in preventing the re-introduction of disease; and that was the reason, I believe, why the restrictions were so extremely unpopular in the East Riding of Yorkshire.

9605. Has your attention been called to the fact that we have had evidence from the representative of the Chamber of Agriculture that the farmers of Yorkshire would not, in his opinion, submit for any length of time to additional restrictions?—They object to those restrictions, and

Chairman—continued.

I think, rightly too. In the first place, they were not general; and in the next place there was no sort of security against the re-introduction of disease.

9606. The willingness of the farmers to submit to those regulations all hinges, you think, upon the security which they fancy they would gain by the animals being slaughtered at the port of landing, and thus the import of disease being prevented?—I believe that they would submit, I will not say cheerfully, because farmers are not a very cheerful lot of people in these times; but I believe they would submit.

9607. They would submit with no more grumbling than is our accustomed right and privilege?—Just so.

9608. Would you suggest any regulations with regard to the transit of inland stock?—I think they have been wonderfully improved of late; I think that the Privy Council have done immense service in that respect.

9609. By establishing these travelling inspectors?—By insisting that trucks and lairs should be cleansed and purified, and that the cattle should be supplied with food and water at different stations. I think that has been of immense advantage. I do not know about the qualifications of the travelling inspectors; I believe they are generals in the army, or something of that sort; but I should like some good, competent, veterinary surgeons to be appointed by the Privy Council to wander all over the country and see that the the local authorities do their duty.

9610. You agree with the witness whom we had on Monday from Scotland, who recommended that the Privy Council should have travelling inspectors going around to enforce the regulations with which the local authorities would be entrusted?—Yes, I would not take from the local authorities the power of appointing inspectors; I would make it still an imperative duty upon them; but I would have those inspectors perform pretty much the same duties as the poor law inspectors, who go round to see that the guardians administer the poor law properly.

9611. That is the same system that the witness from Scotland suggested?—It is a very good one, and I agree with him. With regard to the transportation of cattle from Ireland, I think that that is very much improved; and I believe that the lairs on the other side of the Channel, which were very filthy, and most pernicious in their influences for the spread of disease when I was over there some six or seven years ago, have been very much improved. I would add that in the last Committee I was in a minority of two when I proposed that cattle coming from Ireland should be rested at the ports of debarkation for six hours, and should have food and water before they proceeded inland. I proposed it, and there was only one Member to support me. I think that it is a humane and practical remedy, for I do not believe about feeding and watering cattle in trucks or in transit; I would have them fed and watered before they were put into the trucks, and I would have them fed and watered directly they came out; but the idea of untrucking cattle or feeding and watering them on a journey, I think is a mistake.

9612. You think that the obligation of supplying food and water at the railway stations should apply;

Chairman—continued.

apply to those places where cattle were trucked or taken off the railway?—Yes.

9613. Whilst you believe that the regulations have done much good, you think that by employing the additional staff you have suggested you would increase the benefit that might be derived?—Yes; I think that the present staff is sufficient for the transit of the animals; but what I want the other inspectors to do is to come down and look at our fairs and markets, and see whether the local authority is doing its duty; and if it was not doing its duty I would supersede it, in the same way as the Education Department, under the recent Act, can supersede the school managers if they do not carry it out.

9614. You would empower the central authority to take the power into their own hands on the inspector reporting, and its being proved, that the regulations were not being carried out?—I would, after giving them fair warning.

9615. With regard to the question of agricultural statistics, they have been quoted and relied upon very much for the number of animals that exist in the country; do you think that they are satisfactory?—They may be satisfactory in the gross, but they are misleading when you come to localities. For instance, they are collected in June, when we in Norfolk have few cattle. I wrote to three graziers, one in North Norfolk, one in South Norfolk, and one in West Norfolk, just at haphazard, to ask them to give me the number of cattle that they had over two years old that they had returned to the Board of Trade last June, and the number that they had in the previous December. The total that they had last month was 98, and the total that they had last December was 414. Those were over two years old; and when it has been so frequently said that I exaggerate the import of cattle from Ireland to Norfolk, I can only say that the Great Eastern Railway last year brought into Norfolk no less than 86,000 stores, and at least two-thirds of those came from Ireland. I would say that the trade to London from Norfolk has fallen off considerably since 1865; and that is in consequence of the buyers from the manufacturing districts coming direct to Norfolk and buying cattle at our local markets instead of doing as they did previously, viz., coming to London and buying the cattle after they had journeyed up to London. They buy them at the local markets and of the farmers themselves, and that is a considerable saving, because there is the journey up to London and back again to the manufacturing districts; they save one long railway journey.

9616. I understand you to say that you believe the origin of these contagious diseases to be generally from abroad?—I have no doubt that originally they came from abroad.

9617. Before 1842 there was an amount of disease in this country, and we were not then importing animals from the Continent; how do you account for that?—There is a Member of this Committee who knows very well that in the year 1836, between 20 and 30 Dutch cows were imported into the county of Cork. In my boyhood I have seen a quantity of Dutch cows in Norfolk; I can remember them perfectly well, black and white animals; I have also known that merino rams were imported. I remember reading in a veterinary work by Youatt that in the year 1840 the outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in

Chairman—continued.

London was traced to the introduction of some antelopes into the Zoological Gardens.

9618. Where had they come from?—I believe they had come from Paris.

9619. That is your reply to the statement which is made that there was no importation of disease into this country, and that therefore it must have been originally produced here?—I am almost positive that it came from abroad. I have seen so much scientific evidence (particularly as to cattle plague) of the impossibility of generating those diseases by any sort of treatment that you might apply to cattle, that I am positive that they must come from abroad, and that they do not originate spontaneously in this country at all.

9620. Not pleuro-pneumonia?—Neither pleuro-pneumonia, nor cattle plaugue, nor foot-and-mouth disease, nor sheep-pox.

9621. Has your attention been directed to the evidence of Professor Simonds, and the conclusions to which he came?—Yes.

9622. Do you agree with those conclusions?—I agree with him in his remark that hitherto the prevalence of pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease has not been materially affected by our regulations and restrictions, and I should very much wonder if they had been materially affected, considering the loose way in which those regulations and restrictions are applied.

9623. You mean in consequence of their want of uniformity?—Yes, but I entirely differ from Professor Simonds, when he says, in conclusion, "that the present measures are satisfactory, and that it is better to leave well alone." I believe that if you took proper precautions against the introduction of foreign diseases, and stamped them out here, our cattle would be as healthy as they were previously to 1840. On the other hand, if proper precautions are not taken, I believe that it is perfectly possible, and I think probable, that we shall make these islands the home of every cattle disease upon the face of the globe.

9624. You mean unless some additional precautions are taken both with regard to the foreign import, and with regard to the home movement of animals?—Certainly; I would not separate the two for one moment.

9625. You consider that we have no right to restrict the movement of foreign animals on the ground of stopping the disease coming into this country, unless we are prepared to adopt such regulations as will give us some guarantee that it is stamped out in the country itself?—Yes.

9626. To sum up your evidence, you would recommend that the foreign cattle for these reasons should be slaughtered at the port, that stronger regulations should be issued from the Privy Council for the purpose of eradicating the disease in our own country, that inspectors should be appointed by the Privy Council to see that the local authorities carried out those regulations; you believe that the farmers of this country would be willing to submit to any such regulations with the object in view of stamping out disease; and as to store cattle, you would be prepared to allow them to enter the country under certain restrictions as to quarantine and supervision of the places to which they went?—Yes.

9627. Is there any other point that you would

Mr. *Read*, M.P.

4 July 1877.

Chairman—continued.

like to put before the Committee?—The 400 local authorities that we have in England, are a very great drawback to any uniformity of action, and I do trust that when we have the county boards, which the Government have promised us, there may be a representative assembly, not only of the counties, but of the boroughs within the counties.

9628. In order to carry out the uniformity which you suggested, you think it is necessary that the number of areas should be limited?—I do.

9629. And that there should be an authority dealing with the whole of a county, including its boroughs, for the purpose of carrying out those regulations, which would be issued by the central authority?—Yes. My experience, happily, has been one which shows how well a city and a county can act in unison. We have the great market of Norwich, which is within the area of that city, and we have the same inspector both for the city and for the county; and in everything that we do we are zealously backed up by the city authorities. I may say that if they were to be troublesome I do not know what we should do; the only thing that we could possibly do would be to blockade the market.

9630. Then it is absolutely necessary, for the purpose of carrying out these regulations, that there should be uniformity of action in all parts of a given area?—Certainly, as well as in all parts of the kingdom, if possible.

Mr. *W. E. Forster.*

9631. Another suggestion has been made with regard to the local authorities, viz., that in place of the local authorities, that is to say, authorities deriving their power from the locality, the only authority should be officers appointed by the Privy Council; what do you say to that?—I do not approve of that at all; I would have the inspectors and the officers of the local authority supervised by some inspection from the central authority.

9632. In Ireland all the officials are appointed from Dublin, are they not?—I believe they are; the police are, I believe, in a great number of instances inspectors, or they are employed for carrying out the Act.

9633. As regards foot-and-mouth disease, do you think that they have got rid of it any more in Ireland than we have in England?—Yes, I believe in Ireland they are quite free; I have not heard of a case lately.

9634. How long is it since you have heard of any cases in any imports from Ireland?—Not for months; I may say that I have no authority in that matter, because they might came into Bristol or Milford Haven without my knowing it; but I have seen no symptoms of foot-and-mouth disease in the cattle that we have had for the last 12 months; and, I think, we have very little foot-and-mouth disease from Ireland.

9635. You still get a good many store cattle, I suppose, from Ireland?—Yes, quite two-thirds of our supply.

9626. Do you find that they come in better condition than they did a year or two ago?—Yes.

9637. As if more care had been taken in their transit?—Yes, certainly.

9638. Do you get them from the south or from the north of Ireland chiefly?—They are principally sent from Dublin, but I think they come mostly from the west, and I suppose that a good many come from the south, too. I do not think that we get so many from the north; I think those from the north generally go to Scotland.

9639. You say that in Norfolk you are pretty free from foot-and-mouth disease just now; how is it about pleuro-pneumonia?—I think that we are about as low as ever we were.

9840. Then you have had no pleuro-pneumonia from Ireland lately?—We cannot say anything about that; we hope not.

9641. I understand that your chief suggestion to the Committee is that there should be a strict and permanent rule for the slaughter of all the foreign cattle at the port of debarkation?—All foreign stock.

9642. All foreign fat stock?—Yes.

9643. But you would let in store cattle?—Yes.

9644. From where?—You would allow special breeding animals, I suppose, to come; they would come from America and any part of the world that was free from disease.

9645. But at the present moment, with the attention that you have given to the matter, supposing that you were responsible for issuing the orders, from what countries would you let in the store cattle?—The chief import of stores, of course, would be dairy cows, and they mainly come from Holland; and I think that under the regulations that I have suggested of 14 days' quarantine and two months' supervision afterwards, when they go into the dairy, making that dairy, in fact, an infected district, you might admit cows from Holland.

9646. Then you would oblige them to be quarantined?—I would oblige them to be quarantined for 14 days in order to prevent the introduction of cattle plague, and foot-and-mouth disease; and then afterwards, I would have them branded, and taken to the cowhouses, and there subjected to two months' supervision, as I hope all other infected places will be.

9647. As regards pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease, I think I gather that you would consider that the claims of the farmer to protection against disease would be really met by ordering slaughter at the port of debarkation?—I hope they would.

9648. At any rate, you do not wish to ask for more as regards these two diseases at present?—No; I should like to try this experiment, which I have advocated for the last 12 years.

9649. You say that from all countries in which there is cattle plague they should not be allowed to come in at all?—I do.

9650. That, you are aware, is the case at present?—Yes.

9651. You are aware that they have not been let in from Russia for a long time?—Yes, but I do not see why dead meat should not come in from Russia.

9652. You do not agree with the professors who fear danger from dead meat?—No, I do not. I think that in foreign districts they are so particularly careful about the isolation of plague-striken animals wherever the disease breaks out, that it would be a preventive against the introduction of disease by dead meat.

9653. I did not quite understand the further prohibition

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

prohibition that you would suggest with regard to cattle plague?—I would prohibit cattle from all countries through which cattle plague might come, countries of transit.

9654. To take an illustration, to what countries would you apply that?—I am no authority upon that point whatever, but I should have thought Germany and Belgium.

9655. Am I to understand from you that, notwithstanding all the restrictions which they are themselves making in Germany, you would prohibit the import of all German live cattle?—Yes, I would; I have no belief in the promises of Germany. We heard almost precisely the same thing in the year 1865, before the Cattle Plague Commission.

9656. Would you not admit that the farming interest in Germany is very considerably alarmed by the last outbreak of cattle plague, and that they are likely, in their own defence, to adopt very strong measures?—Very likely; but I believe what was said by the Cattle Plague Commissioners in 1866, "that there is no certain knowledge where cattle come from, and that it is useless to trust to any inspection or precautionary measures of foreign Governments, cattle leaving their own ports, or in case of through traffic."

9657. You are aware, of course, that the largest import of German cattle that we have is from Schleswig-Holstein?—Yes, I hardly call that Germany; I believe it rightly belongs to Denmark.

9658. It is within the German dominions, and the German law applies to it?—I should not prohibit the importation of cattle from Tonning, and I believe that you would get a great many more cattle from Tonning than you do now. If I am rightly informed, we get all the best of the cattle from Tonning now, and then the small and indifferent ones go to Hamburg, and if they are not sold at Hamburg they come to us; and I believe that by making a difference between Tonning and Hamburg, you would get more cattle from Tonning.

9659. Take the case of Belgium; would you stop the whole of the Belgian import from the fear that cattle plague existing in Russia may come through Germany to Belgium?—Again I say that I am not the slightest authority upon this point; but, as I am informed, I should do so.

9660. You were very sanguine, I think, that we should be able to get rid of foot-and-mouth disease if we prevented all importation from abroad?—We must also take very stringent precautions at home.

9661. You are not discouraged, are you, by the fact that in Holland for some years they have had a prohibition of all import of cattle, and yet that they seem not all to get rid of foot-and-mouth disease?—They get rid of neither foot-and-mouth disease, nor of pleuro-pneumonia, I believe.

9662. And yet they have a prohibition of import?—They may have a prohibition of import, but at the same time we are an island, happily, and, therefore, we ought to make use of our sea to protect us.

9663. You said, in answer to the Chairman, that you also thought that we should get rid of pleuro-pneumonia; but your ground of hope with regard to foot-and-mouth disease was that it was a very perishable disease; pleuro-pneumonia is just the

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

contrary, is it not?—Just the contrary; but there is happily this, that it is a disease that in my opinion can only be conveyed by the living animal; and although the period of incubation is so extremely long, sometimes extending even to three months; at the same time, if you kill the animal, I believe you can stop the source of contagion at once.

9664. Probably few men who are not veterinary surgeons have had such good opportunities as you have had of forming opinions with regard to cattle diseases, and I should like to ask your opinion on one point. There are two different schools, one which says that foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia are both of them infectious diseases, and are never spontaneously generated, while the other school thinks that they are; what is your opinion as to that matter?—I am positive, so far as my knowledge goes, that they are never produced spontaneously in this country.

9665. You do not think that any amount of bad treatment, in the shape of putting them on bad soil, or over-crowding them in transit, would bring on foot-and-mouth disease?—No, because if that were so we should have had it developed years ago. I can remember when the cattle from Scotland used to walk to Norwich Hill, and they suffered an immense amount from their very long journey; and in these days they could not have gone half the distance.

9666. But we have had foot-and-mouth disease ever since 1839, have we not?—No; since 1840, I think. I think we had pleuro-pneumonia in 1839, and foot-and-mouth disease in 1840, or about that time. But after the restrictions in consequence of the cattle plague in 1866 and 1867, for eighteen months we did not see a single case of foot-and-mouth disease in Norfolk.

9667. Foot-and-mouth disease is a very fluctuating disease, is it not; sometimes we are, for two or three years, apparently, without it, and then it comes again?—That is so.

9668. You stated in your examination in chief, I think, that, in 1875, several animals came from Belgium with foot-and-mouth disease, and that the Veterinary Department knew nothing about it?—I think I read it in the Report.

9669. I have here the Appendix to the Report for 1875, in which there is this statement: "In the beginning of 1875 foot-and-mouth disease was prevalent in many parts of the country, and the extent of its existence on the Continent may be gathered from the fact that during January over 1,600 diseased animals were landed at English ports from Germany, Belgium, France, and the Netherlands." "In April foot-and-mouth disease continued to exist, and the reports from the Continent showed that the affection had attained a high rate of prevalence in Germany, France, Belgium, Netherlands, Denmark, and Sweden"?—I meant that they had no official intimation from any of those countries that the disease existed.

9670. Would not that statement in the Report seem to show that they had that official intimation?—You do not mean to have an official statement of that. I knew it by what I read in the papers. That is in the Appendix; but if you look into the General Report you will see that they had no official communication from either Holland or Belgium of the existence of that disease.

9671. Supposing

Mr. *Read*, M.P.

4 July 1877.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

9671. Supposing that your suggestion was carried out, and that all animals were ordered to be slaughtered at the port of landing, and that there were very strict regulations to prohibit all animals from any country from which there was reason to fear the import of cattle plague, what, in that case, would be the restrictions that you would enforce, with regard to home diseases, taking foot-and-mouth disease first?—I should apply to foot-and-mouth disease the same regulations that are now in force with respect to pleuro-pneumonia, with the exception of slaughter.

9672 That is to say, you would isolate until they had a certificate of health?—Yes.

9673. Have you considered for how long you would isolate them?—For 28 days in case of foot-and-mouth disease.

9674. In addition to this isolation, would you do anything with regard to the stoppage of markets?—If the disease became general, certainly I should.

9675. Would you enforce stoppage of transit?—Yes, a limited stoppage of transit.

9676. When had you your market on the Castle Hill at Norwich last stopped?—It has not been stopped since the cattle plague of 1865 or 1866, I forget now which it was. It was always kept open for the sale of fat stock even in those times.

9677. And what would you do in case of a stoppage for foot-and-mouth disease?—I should limit certain markets for the sale of fat stock, and have them slaughtered there.

9678. But the stoppage of store stock was a great inconvenience, was it not?—Yes, it was a considerable inconvenience, but it has its good result.

9679. You feel quite sure that the farmers in Norfolk, whose views nobody is better able to tell us than you are, would assent to a stoppage of the markets, not merely for one market day but for several market days, for foot-and-mouth disease?—I think that the farmers would; but I am quite sure that the dealers, and salesmen, and the butchers would be very troublesome; and it is those gentlemen who, I believe, generally make their wants known to the Privy Council.

9680. Would you stop the importation of German sheep as well as of German cattle, for fear of cattle plague?—I think that they might come to the specified markets to be named.

9681. My reason for asking that question is on account of the large import of German sheep and Belgian sheep. I find that, in 1876, from Germany there were imported 315,619 sheep, and from Belgium 254,535 sheep, making altogether 570,154, or more than half of the total import, which was 1,044,262?—Just so. I would say, with regard to the importation of German sheep, that I find that sending them to Deptford does not materially decrease their numbers; I find that in the months of April, May, and June, this year, there were more at the Deptford Market than there were last year, In March last year there were 72,000, and in March this year there were 85,000; in April last year there were 89,000, and in April this year, 103,000. They all go to Deptford now.

Mr. *Elliot*.

9682. You said, did you not, that in your opinion there is no inspection which will suffice to keep us free from foreign diseases?—None.

Mr. *Elliot*—continued.

9683. Therefore we must think of our own farmer, and not so much of the foreigner; if he is alarmed at the restrictions that are likely to be put on, the only way is to have the restrictions that we have already got; we have no guarantee that they have hitherto had, or that they are are likely to have, restrictions that will keep us free from disease?—No, I do not think that anything which we we have will keep us from disease; and in the interests of our own consumers of meat, quite as much as in the interests of the farmers, I would desire to be free from foreign diseases.

9684. You spoke of the animals being slaughtered at Norwich; have you heard a plan or scheme suggested for having slaughter-houses throughout the whole country?—I have heard it mentioned, but I have never heard any practical suggestion.

9685. If that were done, would it not be a great preventive of disease?—I think it would.

9686. Do you not think that the restrictions which are suggested would lead towards having slaughter-houses throughout the country?—I think that the dead-meat trade will develope itself throughout the country.

9687. Would you limit the number of ports of debarkation throughout the country?—Certainly.

9688 Have you any idea of how many there should be?—I should think that half-a-dozen would suffice for England.

9689. Would you make those ports quarantine ports as well?—No, I would have all the London cows, for instance, come to Harwich; then you might have a small quarantine ground at Southampton, in case of any pedigreed stock coming in. It would be also a port for the shipment of fat cattle, I should think.

9690. Supposing that in the neighbourhood of a port there was a large mining population, and it were thought necessary to have an importation of cattle at that port, would you have some law passed to allow them to have cattle introduced there?—I would allow them to be introduced into any port where necessity arose, provided that there was proper accommodation and means of isolation.

9691. The opinion has been expressed that there is less pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease in this country now than there has been some time; do you agree with the opinion that the regulations of the local authorities, and of the Privy Council have assisted in making the country so free?—I think that they have in a measure.

Mr. *Dease*.

9692. Did I correctly understand you to recommend that for the cattle imported from Ireland you would have at the port of debarkation watering places, and places of rest for six hours before they were sent on inland?—I would, in order that they might be fed, rested, and watered.

9693. Would six hours be a sufficient time?—Plenty.

9694. To carry out that plan, it would be necessary to have a place either at the port or at the railway station where those arrangements could be effected, would it not?—It would be better to have it at the railway station, I apprehend.

9695. It would be some expense to the exporter, I suppose, or the man who brought over the

Mr. *Dease*—continued.

the cattle?—I should think that there would be a certain slight extra cost, but I am quite sure that the stock would be enhanced in value by being so humanely and properly treated.

9696. I think I understood you to recommend that a quarantine of 14 days should be established for the milking cows imported from the Continent into England?—Yes, and a supervision of two months.

9697. Would not a quarantine of 14 days affect the milking quality of those cows very much, even afterwards, when they were landed?—I suppose that they would be looked after and properly attended to in the quarantine grounds, and milked. If they were in good milk, the milk would nearly pay for their quarantining, I should think.

9698. Have you heard of a dairy company established at Aylesbury?—Yes.

9699. It is said that there, by the application of a refrigerating process, they are able to transmit milk to London in a good state, and to keep it for a considerable time; if such a plan could be generally used, is it your opinion that the London market could be supplied with milk from Cheshire and from the great dairy districts, without the importation of dairy cattle at all from the Continent?—I think it could. I quite agree with the last witness, that good short-horn cows are more profitable as dairy cows than any foreigners; but they certainly cost more money, and there are a great number of men with limited capital who want to buy a cheap article, and therefore they buy these foreign cows.

9700. If milk could be sent from these dairy counties, would it be as profitable to the producers as the making of cheese?—I should think that it would, certainly, and perhaps more profitable. Whether it would be good for the land or not, I will not say.

9701. I suppose that if that could be done, it would be an advantage to London itself and to the health of London to be able to do away with the dairies in the centre of a great population?—Yes, I think it is very desirable to get rid of dairies from the heart of a great city. When you consider the enormous quantity of food that you have to bring in, and the considerable amount of manure that there must be to remove, and also the manure that will naturally go into the sewers, I think that it is much better economy to have your dairies at least outside the town, in the suburban parts of this metropolis, for instance, rather than in the heart of the city.

9702. So that, in fact, if milk could be brought in as the Aylesbury Dairy Company seem to manage it, and if we could prevent the importation of dairy stock from abroad, it would tend to improve the health of the metropolis, as well as to give us a sufficient supply of milk from our own dairy farms?—Quite so, and if we could be sure of getting rid of disease, I think that the quantity and the quality of the milk produced would be enormously increased; I believe that very serious disorders are engendered in children by drinking unwholesome milk which has been produced by animals suffering from foot-and-mouth disease.

9703. Have you ever heard of an instance of a human being taking the foot-and-mouth disease?—I had an attack of foot-and-mouth disease that was very troublesome, and we had to poultice the feet of the animals, and I asked the yard-

Mr. *Dease*—continued.

man's wife to wash the cloths with which we put on those poultices; and she certainly had an eruption in her mouth, and also between her fingers; that we put down to foot-and-mouth disease; but I do not know whether it was so or not. But all warm-blooded animals, I believe, will take it.

9704. Does not that make it a much more serious matter?—Yes. That is a very exceptional case; I never heard of another.

Mr. *King-Harman.*

9705. How do you account at all for what I have noticed in Ireland with regard to foot-and-mouth disease, viz., that in the last four months of the year it is so much more prevalent than it is in the early part of the year?—Generally speaking, when there is any great movement of cattle you get a great spread of foot-and-mouth disease, and I think about the autumn you have a larger amount of transit in Ireland; we certainly have in Norfolk, and we generally have the disease worse about Michaelmas than at any other time.

9706. That would go to prove that the movement of cattle increases the disease, and that where the cattle are comparatively free from movement the disease is much less in the country?—Quite so; it is the transit that spreads the disease most rapidly.

9707. You suggest six hours rest for cattle before they go on board, do you not?—Not before they go on board, but after they are landed here; before they go on their journey inland.

9708. Then you would not propose their being rested before they go on their voyage?—I should like them to be inspected, and fed and watered there; I do not say how long they should stop, but they certainly ought to be fed and watered before they are put on board.

9709. Do you not think it very important that they should be cool before they go on board?—Certainly.

9710. And you would say that an overdriven beast driven on board the steamers and frightened, as he must naturally be, and packed with a quantity of others, must be very apt to take, if not to engender, disease?—Certainly he would be more apt to take it.

9711. At several of the ports in Ireland there is water provided for the cattle before they are put on board, but the drovers have an objection to giving them water, because they say it causes scour; do you believe that there can be anything in that?—I do not think that a bullock should have an unlimited quantity of water when he is very hot; he should have some, but not as much as he could fill himself with.

9712. With regard to the import of cattle, what would you do with cattle from the Channel Islands?—If I know anything about the Channel Islands cattle they are perfectly healthy. They have no stock going in there, and I should treat them as I should treat Ireland or the Isle of Man.

9713. They are generally landed at Southampton, are they not?—Yes.

9714. You suggested quarantine at Southampton for pedigreed stock; would you treat the Jersey cattle in the same way?—I should if it was proved that there was or ever had been any sort of disease in the island.

9715. In point of fact, if you were making a report from this Committee, you would put a

Mr. *Read*, M.P. 4 July 1877.

Mr. *King-Harman*—continued

separate paragraph for these cattle; you would not treat them as if they were not free from disease?—I think that there is no necessity for quarantining those animals.

9716. Would you not put a Government Inspector on those islands?—I think that would be a very good thing.

9717. There is one point about which I am anxious to get an opinion from you, and that is as to the movement of small stores in Ireland; as you know, the small farmers on the hill-sides breed the small store cattle, and they are then taken up as yearlings by the larger farmers and drovers; if you stop their movement in the case of foot-and-mouth disease, how would you propose that the small farmer should meet his rent, as many of them do by the one or two young cattle that they sell?—I should not restrict the movement except during the time of the disease; at the very most it would not be more than a month.

9718. But the disease might be in the district for a great deal more than a month?—It might be in the district, but I would not prevent the movement of stock all over the county in case of one or two farms being infected; I would isolate those cattle, and I would allow fair movement of the other stock.

9719. But if you only isolated a farm or two, do you think that you would have sufficient security?—I should think that if you drew a cordon round an infected place that would be sufficient. Of course if it was a very small farm, you would have to take in two or three adjoining farms too.

Mr. *Cameron* of Lochiel.

9720. You recommend that, in case of the importation of dairy cows, there should be a quarantine of 14 days, and an inspection of two months in the dairy to which they are sent?—Yes.

9721. Do you think that that would constitute any hardship to the owners of the dairy?—I do not think it would; because I am told that, as a rule, dairymen buying these cows inoculate them, and they actually quarantine them themselves, and in a great many instances keep them in a separate shed.

9722. I suppose that, as a rule, a dairyman who bought a foreign cow would not want to sell her within two months?—No, unless she happened to fall down with some complaint; in which case he would very likely want to get rid of her.

9723. So that, in point of fact, in case a man wanted to resell a cow within two months, it would not operate as a hardship if he was not allowed to do so?—I think not. It would certainly not be so hard as it would be upon a farmer who had a lot of beasts ready to sell.

Sir *George Jenkinson*.

9724. You have spoken of slaughter at the port of debarkation; do you consider that slaughter at the port of debarkation would be as efficacious against contagion as slaughter at the port of embarkation?—No; I should prefer, if I was made a dictator, excluding all live imports, and having nothing but a dead meat supply.

9725. Then you would wish to qualify your previous evidence in that respect?—I did qualify it in my examination in chief. I said, first of all, that I was in favour of a total supply of dead meat.

Sir *George Jenkinson*—continued.

9726. I was rather struck with that, because I know that you were present at the Chamber of Agriculture when we carried that resolution, that slaughter should be asked for at the port of embarkation?—I advocate this as an alternative measure, and perhaps only as a temporary measure; I do not think that the country is in a state to depend entirely upon foreign dead meat at present.

9727. Do you think that if cattle were slaughtered at the port of debarkation it would be any protection at all against cattle plague; for instance, the last outbreak of cattle plague in London?—I have said that I do not believe that in the case of the "Castor" the cattle plague got out at Deptford Market; I believe it was carried from the ship into the dairies of the metropolis; but I would prohibit, as I have stated before, the importation of stock from all countries where cattle plague exists, and also from those countries of transit through which it might come. Therefore, I should put a stoppage upon the import of cattle from Germany at all times; certainly I should after I had known that the cattle plague was in Silesia.

9728. With regard to dairy cows, you spoke of them as store stock; do you still consider that dairy cows are store stock; I ask this because a previous witness, Mr. Gebhardt, very strongly asserted that dairy cows could not be called store stock?—Mr. Gebhardt, I believe, is a foreigner, and not perhaps well versed in the terms of our language although he has been here very many years; but I should call any stock that is kept for the purpose of breeding or milking store stock. He divides cattle into three classes; I should never think of dividing cattle into more than two classes, store stock and fat stock.

9729. Do you think it possible to have quarantine at different ports without making those ports the hotbeds of disease?—I would have quarantine at a place like Harwich, and it should be a quarantine only for store stock, and no fat cattle should be landed there.

9730. You spoke of Southampton. I believe Southampton is a port where quarantine is carried out already?—Perhaps I am wrong about that, but I fancy that at Southampton the danger of disease is very little from store stock, because they would be pedigree stock that came in from America.

9731. With regard to the trade of store stock at Bristol from Ireland, and the six hours' rest and the quarantine that you advocate; Mr. Peters, one of the witnesses, spoke of himself seeing 4,000 landed in one day: how could they carry out the six hours' rest and the feeding there, considering the number that are landed there almost daily?—They do not all come in the same ship, I suppose, or all at the same time.

9732. He spoke of their being landed within two hours?—Then some of them would have to have a longer rest.

9733 How would you carry out your suggestion with regard to a large importation, which is constant at Bristol?—I would have the lairs either close to the ship or close to the railway; you do not want a very large lair for watering and giving cattle a little hay.

9734. But you think that it would be possible to land constantly 4,000 animals in the course of a couple

Sir *George Jenkinson*—continued.

a couple of hours from ships from Ireland at Bristol, and to rest all those animals for six hours, and feed them?—I think that it might be done. You could not have them all rested for exactly the same time, but some of them might be rested perhaps for a little longer, and it would do them no harm.

Mr. *Pease*.

9735. You stated that several outbreaks, I think, of foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia, had taken place in Norfolk from cattle brought from the Islington Market?—Foot-and-mouth, but not pleuro-pneumonia.

9736. Do many cattle, as a rule, go back again into Norfolk from the Islington Market?—No, they do not do that; but the cattle from Islington would come as far, perhaps, as Colchester, and there be mixed with store cattle that would come on to Norwich.

9737. And so they would bring the infection back into the country?—Yes.

9738. You propose, in order to avoid that, that the Islington Market should be made a market through which cattle should be merely passed for slaughter?—Yes; and I would do that wherever I could. I think that at Liverpool, for instance, it is quite possible to have two markets, one for stores and the other for fat cattle.

9739. And you think that by that means the risk of the spread of infection would be considerably lessened?—Certainly.

9740. If you did that with these Islington cattle which produce taint, why should you not do the same with the quarantined cattle, and why should you not allow fat cattle to be put into quarantine, and then go forward, say from Hull to Leeds or to Bradford, for the purpose of slaughter?—Because the quarantining of fat cattle would certainly act very much against their coming at all.

9741. Do you not think that a fat beast would be after 14 days' quarantine worth fully his keep more than he was upon landing?—No, I think not.

9742. Would he not have more bloom upon him after 14 days' rest, and sell for more?—If a bullock was fat he would require such a very expensive style of food to keep him going that I am quite sure that as a rule it would not answer.

9743. Therefore you knock it entirely out of your consideration?—Yes; I would say, on the other hand, that if disease existed in any part of England through which cattle were sent to the Metropolitan Market, I would shut up the Metropolitan Market altogether, in the same way as it is now, so that they could not go beyond the confines of the metropolis.

9744. Do you recollect the evidence of the Leeds butcher, who said that he had been obliged to give up buying his fat cattle at Hull on account of the great inconvenience of taking them as dead meat into Leeds?—Yes; I have heard of him and several other butchers saying the same thing.

9745. You do not think that there is much in that?—It disorders the trade, no doubt; and people like their own ways, and it would be some time before they accepted the change; but if they were bound to do it, they would soon fall into the new arrangement.

9746. Of course we are all trying to get the maximum of safety with the minimum of regulation?—Just so.

9747. Do you think that it is compatible with safety to carry these fat beasts forward into the inland markets to kill?—I do not think it is.

Mr. *Pease*—continued.

Colonel *Kingscote*.

9748. One word with regard to Jersey and Guernsey; is it not the fact that no foreign animals are allowed to be landed in Guernsey and Jersey, and that for generations they have had no disease there?—I have read that that is so, but I have no personal knowledge upon that point.

9749. Therefore you would not wish to cut them off by compelling slaughter or anything more than the quarantine which you suggest at Southampton or other ports?—Nothing more than that certainly.

9750. You agree with the witnesses who have stated before this Committee that foot-and-mouth disease causes very great loss, not only to the producer, the breeder, but also to the consumer?—It does. I should say that whereas cattle plague is so deadly and horrible a disease that we are sure to take measures to extinguish it, and that whereas pleuro-pneumonia is very fatal, still, at the same time, there can be no doubt whatever that foot-and-mouth disease destroys more meat and milk than all the other diseases put together.

9751. You think, therefore, that it is worth while making a strong effort to try and get rid of this disease?—I do.

9752. Under the system which you advocate of an uniform action of the different local authorities, under Government inspection, do you think that it would be feasible to stamp out foot-and-mouth disease, not by slaughter, but by isolation?—I do. I wish to guard myself against advocating in any way Government interference where it is unnecessary. I would have the local authorities appoint their own inspectors, and I would make it compulsory upon them to do so; but I would have Government inspectors supervise them, and see that they were doing their duty.

9753. Supposing that foot-and-mouth disease or cattle plague breaks out on the borders of two counties, or has happened in my experience on the borders of three counties, you have one regulation in one county, another in another, and another in the third; how would you propose to remedy that; would you have the Government inspectors omnipotent, or how would you manage it?—In the case of a fresh outbreak of cattle plague I would make the Government responsible in every way; they should supersede the local authority in every way in case of cattle plague breaking out. With regard to three different local authorities making three different orders, I would insist upon there being certain orders issued by the Privy Council which should be universally absolute. But of course if you had foot-and-mouth disease in the East Riding of Yorkshire I would not say that you would necessarily want, for instance, to put the county of Kent under restrictions; and they should have power to limit the restrictions to certain districts.

9754. Supposing that there were an effort made to get rid of foot-and-mouth disease by isolating that part of the country where it broke

Mr. *Read*, M.P.

4 July 1877.

Colonel *Kingscote*—continued.

out, you would have no need for restrictions in other parts of the country?—Certainly not. I should not wait for the local authority to go and beg the Privy Council to do this; I would make it incumbent upon the Privy Council, who must be aware of these outbreaks, to put the law in force and to issue their orders.

9755. You would make it compulsory for the farmers or breeders in the first place to report the disease to the local authority, and for the local authority immediately to report it to the Privy Council?—Yes; in the same way as they do, I believe.

9756. Supposing that by those means you got rid of foot-and-mouth disease to a very great extent, and your regulations were carried out, do you believe that more cattle would be kept or bred in your county, for instance?—There certainly would be a greater number of stock bred in England generally. We are such an essentially winter grazing county that I do not think we should breed very many more. But I may say that since the year 1865 the breeding powers of this country have been very much reduced; small farmers who lost their cattle then have been unable to replace them; and then again these other two diseases, pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease, afflict the breeding districts much more than they do the grazing districts like Norfolk, although, of course, we have an immense amount of disease; if there is disease anywhere in England, Scotland, or Ireland, we are sure to have it sooner or later. Still, the loss to a man who kills a bullock affected with pleuro-pneumonia is nothing like the loss to a man who loses his cow.

9757. You believe that the fear of the disease makes many farmers, great and small throughout the Kingdom, buy their cattle in and sell out, instead of breeding?—Yes, I am quite sure that it does in consequence of the fear of the disease, and the inconvenience of the restrictions which follow an outbreak.

9758. Would you have all drovers who ply for hire at fairs licensed; I do not mean to say the farmers' own men?—Yes; I should especially on the score of humanity, independently of the prevention of disease, and I think that it would be a good thing to license cattle salesmen and cattle dealers as well.

Mr. *Arthur Peel.*

9759. I gather from your evidence, that if a foreign country was unclean, so to speak, you would prohibit the cattle coming from it altogether, and if it could show a clean bill of health, you would admit the cattle from it to be slaughtered at the port; but I also gather that you consider that very few foreign countries could show a clean bill of health?—I said with regard to cattle plague, not with regard to the minor diseases.

9760. Do you agree with the opinion which Mr. Howard expressed, that this country would not stand the exclusion of cattle, except on the condition of their being slaughtered at the port of debarkation?—I think that they would stand it at the ports of debarkation; I do not see any reason why they should not, because the transit of dead meat from the ports of debarkation into the inland towns is, I think, certain to be successful.

9761. You have not expressed your confidence

Mr. *Arthur Peel*—continued.

in the conduct of foreign Governments; but supposing that a foreign Government were to say, "We will compel the slaughter of diseased cattle, and we will isolate infected cattle," would you make any distinction in favour of the foreign country that adopted those regulations?—No; take Holland for instance; the pleuro-pneumonia rules have been enforced there, they have slaughtered and they have isolated, and they have sent us in lots of disease as well.

9762. The idea is the idea of Professor Brown, who suggests in the Report that if foreign countries should not make these regulations, then they should be scheduled; would you admit that relaxation?—I have really very little faith in the restrictions that are made by foreign countries. I think it would be safer and better to rely only on our own restrictions.

9763. If you could see a security that the foreign country would carry out those regulations, you would admit the cattle?—Yes, but I would not admit them inland then. I would admit no fat stock inland, and no stores without a quarantine. I am sure that there are some countries that send us cattle, whose stock is very much more healthy than our own; but at the same time, if you are at the end of a long transit of animals converging to this country, you are almost sure to have some sort of disease caught even by healthy cattle.

9764. Then your plan in short is absolute exclusion of live cattle, except, of course, these milch cows?—I do not mean exclusion, because I would kill them at the ports.

Chairman.

9765. I think you were asked with regard to the extent to which foot-and-mouth disease at present exists in the Netherlands, and whether that exists notwithstanding that Holland and the Netherlands have prohibited for some time the import of cattle into that country?—Yes.

9766. But you are aware, I suppose, that until very recently those diseases were not dealt with by Holland with a view of exterminating them; that with regard to pleuro-pneumonia until only the other day they treated it by inoculation, but their regulations were anything but strict or severe?—I think they have been trying to deal with pleuro-pneumonia in Holland for three or four years.

9767. That was the case, was it not, up to a certain time?—Up to three or four years ago, I think.

9768. Mr. May, the Consul General of the Netherlands, told us in evidence that it was in 1873 that they began adopting the other system, and that since they have adopted that system, in the province of Friesland at all events, they have very nearly stamped out the disease?—I think so.

9769. That shows that as soon as they put in force the proper restrictions, combining them with the restriction as to the import from abroad, they effect what you think is possible in this country?—Just so. With regard to pleuro-pneumonia, I do not think they take any precautions about it in Belgium with the idea of stamping it out, as they do in Holland. Although you have all these cases reported of cattle slaughtered in Holland for pleuro-pneumonia, Belgium being divided from it by some imaginary line, a ditch, or road, you do not hear of any cattle being affected with pleuro-pneumonia in Belguim, although

Chairman—continued.

although you are quite sure that they are so affected, and that the German Government have prohibited the import in consequence of the prevalence of pleuro-pneumonia.

Mr. *M'Lagan.*

9770. As regards the Dutch cows you would allow them to come in and to be kept in quarantine for about 14 days, and then sent into the dairies in London; or would you allow them to go to any part of the kingdom?—I would under certain provisions, but they would have to be followed, and they would have to be isolated for two months.

9771. Do you not think that in transporting stock after only 14 days' quarantine would be attended with considerable danger?—I think that there would be a certain amount of danger, but I think that 14 days' quarantine would be sufficient to guard against cattle plague, foot-and-mouth disease; and the further supervision of two months, I hope, would be a fair protection against pleuro-pneumonia. I would rather not have them, as I said before.

Mr. *Pease.*

9772. In the event of your suggestion of two months' supervision being carried out, would you allow any animal to leave a dairy into which these foreign animals had been introduced?—Certainly not. I hope that we shall extend the period of isolation for pleuro-pneumonia generally to two months. During that time no animal should leave that infected place, and I would subject these foreign cows to exactly similar regulations.

Mr. *Pease*—continued.

Chairman.

9773. You do not think that that would interfere with the trade which is a constantly flowing trade, the animals being brought in and sold as soon as they go off their milk?—No.

Mr. *Pease.*

9774. Are you aware of any quantity of cattle coming into this country to be fed as store animals?—There used to be a large quantity imported into Norfolk, and when I began farming as a young man, being, as a good many farmers are, rather short of cash, I used to buy those store animals. In the first 18 months I lost 42 of them from pleuro-pneumonia, and I then learnt that pleuro-pneumonia was very rife in Holland, and that hay was exceedingly dear, and that consequently they had sent off a large quantity of these cheap stores; but I would rather feed the very worst Irish bullock that ever grew than buy a Dutch store in future.

9775–9864. Are they brought in now and used?—I believe that there is a man in Norfolk who has a few Dutch cows, but I have not seen a Dutch store animal in our market or in our county for a great number of years, I may say.

Friday, 6th July 1877.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Assheton.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. James Corry.
Mr. Dease.
Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.
Mr. Elliot.
Mr. W. E. Forster.
Mr. French.
Mr. John Holms.
Sir George Jenkinson.
Mr. King-Harman.
Colonel Kingscote.
Mr. M'Lagan.
Mr. Murphy.
Sir Rainald Knightley.
Mr. Norwood.
Mr. Pease.
Mr. Arthur Peel.
Mr. Ritchie.
Sir Henry Selwin Ibbetson.
Mr. Torr.

SIR HENRY SELWIN IBBETSON, BART., IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. CHARLES LENNOX PEEL, recalled; and further Examined.

Mr. *Peel.*

July 1877.

Chairman.

9865. I BELIEVE you wish to state what the recent action of the Privy Council has been?—I wish to explain how the matter stands now, because the Orders perhaps would not explain themselves. From and after the 30th of last month, that is from the 1st of this month, all the Orders of the local authorities which were in force at that time are revoked, in consequence of the revocation of what is called the Cattle Plague Order, 1877, by which local authorities were authorised to make regulations for their respective districts. The Privy Council Order which applied to the East Riding of Yorkshire expired of itself; the Privy Council Order which applied to Middlesex also expired; and the Privy Council Order referring to Lincolnshire has been revoked. Therefore at this moment the practical effect is that the only restriction that remains in the county is the cordon round the Metropolis.

9866. All the other restrictions that were put in force in consequence of the outbreak of cattle plague have been revoked?—They have been revoked. The cordon will remain round the metropolis until we see the effect of restocking the infected dairies in London which is now going on.

9867. Those are, of course, being inspected?—They are all under inspection. They have been twice disinfected; in the first place, by the local authority, and afterwards we took them in hand and thoroughly disinfected them, and did everything which was necessary.

Chairman—continued.

9868. As soon as the reports show that there is no probable chance of an outbreak again in those dairies, a return will be made by the Privy Council, probably, as to the condition of things that existed before the outbreak?—I hope so. So far as cattle plague is concerned, we shall be free, I think. The Order prohibiting fairs and markets in the metropolis is also in force except by license.

9869. But all the county Orders have been either dropped or revoked?—They have been either dropped or revoked, and the country is quite free now, with the exception of the metropolis. The special Orders relating to cattle plague in London remain in force; that is to say, if there should be cattle plague we retain the power of dealing with it; but of course as there is no cattle plague those Orders are inoperative.

9870. But the power which you take is still in force?—It is still in force. I have been asked by the Swedish and Norwegian Minister to put in the regulations of the Swedish Government and of the Norwegian Government. They sent a gentleman over from Sweden, but he was not able to stop to put them in himself. (*The same were handed in*, see *Appendix.*)

9871. Those are the regulations which they have now adopted, and which are now in force in those two countries?—Those are the regulations.

9872. Those complete the regulations with regard to the northern countries—Quite so.

Professor GEORGE THOMAS BROWN, re-called; and further Examined.

Chairman.

9873. YOU are able, I suppose, to tell the Committee that, in your opinion, the cattle plague, which you described on your first examination, has practically ceased in the country?—The country has not yet been officially declared free, but I am in a position to state that there is no case of cattle plague in this country.

9874. We have just heard from Mr. Peel that the metropolis is now the only part of the country which is affected by the restrictions which were put on in consequence of that disease?—That is so.

9875. Can you give the Committee any idea of what effect those regulations that have been in force with regard to cattle plague have had upon the progress of foot-and-mouth disease during this year?—There is no doubt that the regulations, affecting as they did a considerable part of the country, have resulted in restricting the progress of foot-and-mouth disease very considerably. At the latter part of the year 1876, the new outbreak, which I expected, and which I had hinted at in my previous reports, had already commenced; and we have returns from various counties which show that, up to the middle of the spring, the disease was progressing somewhat rapidly. Since the operation of the regulations which the local authorities made under the Cattle Plague Order, 1877, the cases have very much decreased, and from some counties, where disease existed to a considerable extent, we have blank returns.

9876. That confirms what Mr. Howard stated with regard to the effect of those regulations in his county, for instance?—It does.

9877. What are the counties from which you have blank returns?—We had no returns of cases from Cambridgeshire in May, and in the previous month there were 551 cases returned.

9878. In Cambridgeshire, in the course of a month, the cases have practically ceased to exist?—For some reason the cases have declined to nil. In Cheshire, where the disease only existed to a very limited extent, only five cases being returned in April, we had a blank return in May. The same thing was true of Northumberland, and Notts, and Oxford. We had blank returns also from Somerset, Suffolk, Westmorland, and the North Riding of Yorkshire. In Bedfordshire, 13 cases were returned for the month of May.

9879. Have you any return with regard to Wiltshire, where Mr. Stratton's evidence showed that the disease had been very prevalent?—The return from Wilts for April was 17 cases, and in May it was reduced only by two, the number returned being 15.

9880. With regard to those counties which you have stated show blank returns, were the cattle plague regulations put in force strictly in those districts?—I can only say, in reference to some of them, that they were. I have not had time to go through the whole of the returns in order to ascertain the proportion.

9881. May we connect in our minds the cessation of disease in those counties with the restrictions which were put on in consequence of cattle plague this year?—We can, certainly, in some of the counties; in Bedford, for example, and Berks, and also in Kent; I am aware that in those places the regulations were in force, and also in Middlesex, where they seem to have had the greatest effect. In Middlesex, the disease began in January with three cases; it had gone on in February to 86; in March, April, and May, the returns were blank; and I may state also that we have had no cases of disease detected by the inspector of the metropolitan market for some two or three months past, whereas, up to the commencement of the cattle plague, the disease was increasing there very rapidly.

Chairman—continued.

9882. That is the Islington Market?—That is the Islington Market.

9883. Whilst the disease was increasing rapidly in that market up to the time of the issuing of those stringent regulations, since that time it has diminished very considerably?—It has. Then I have a further return here for the end of June, in which I see that some of those counties that were declared free last month have had fresh cases; in Bedford, for example, there is one attack recorded; in Berks, one attack; in the North Riding of Yorkshire five attacks; and in the West Riding, which had previously been free, there were 16 attacks; and I am afraid I must state as my strong conviction that, as soon as those regulations are revoked all over the country, and particularly when the cordon is removed from the metropolis, the accession of disease, which I expected, will really occur.

9884. In your mind the diminution and extirpation of this disease is necessarily connected with strict regulations?—Undoubtedly.

9885. And the effect that has been produced by these strict regulations is shown in the statements which you have made with regard to the cessation of this particular complaint in those counties?—It is.

9886. Looking at that, does it alter the opinion which you previously stated to the Committee as to the time required to eradicate contagious diseases in this country or otherwise?—My conviction is, that we should not succeed in getting entirely rid of foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia, unless those regulations were continued for a very considerable period, and I base that opinion upon the facts which have come under my own observation. For example, during the great outbreak of cattle plague in 1865, the most severe regulations were applied all over the country from March 1866, and they were continued with more or less variation until the summer of 1868. During that long period, we did not succeed in stamping out either of those diseases. I saw both of them, and foot-and-mouth disease in its most virulent form, at various periods during the whole of that time.

9887. Did you see that disease breaking out in districts where those severe regulations have been applied?—Certainly, in districts where the cattle plague rules were being enforced in consequence of the presence of cattle plague; and we have seen pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease existing with cattle plague in the same animal.

Professor *Brown.*

6 July 1877.

Chairman—continued.

9888. The diminution of foot-and-mouth disease in the case of those counties strengthens your opinion that there is no foundation for the statement that foot-and-mouth disease could not be stamped out by strict regulations?—It does.

9889. And your opinion also is that regulations would not, without remaining in force a considerable time, have any chance of stamping out the disease?—That is my conviction, judging from what I saw during the cattle plague time.

9890. Do you think that foot-and mouth disease would die out under these regulations?—I believe that by the continued application of the most stringent measures for the requisite time we should ultimately get rid of the disease, or reduce it to such proportions that it would be a matter of comparative unimportance; but I altogether fail to see the slightest ground for the assumption that the disease would die out if you simply cut off the supply from abroad irrespectively of any regulations which might be applied in this country.

9891. You think that the stopping of the import of the disease from abroad if it comes from there, must be combined with those strict regulations for eradicating it in the country itself before there would be a possibility of getting rid of it entirely?—Undoubtedly; we have the fact before us that the disease was introduced here in 1839, that it remained certainly up to 1842 in a very virulent form, when, if it would die out, it had had the opportunity of dying out; because no importation of foreign cattle took place to any extent, and, as a matter of fact, it was totally prohibited from about 1825 to 1842.

9892. Can you speak as to what the regulations in regard to the disease in the country were at that time; were they sufficiently severe then?—There were no regulations at that time; but that illustrates, to my mind, the point that the disease will not die out if it is left entirely to itself, the only precaution taken being to prohibit foreign imports, as was at that time done.

9893. You agree, therefore, with those witnesses who say that strict regulations with regard to the home trade must be enforced at the same time with the prohibition as to foreign importation of disease?—I have no doubt of it, and the examples which have been given of America and Australia seem to me to indicate that; because in both those countries, assuming that the disease ever was introduced, though the fact has never been satisfactorily demonstrated to my mind, whatever disease was introduced, described as foot-and-mouth disease, was dealt with very rigidly; I believe that the diseased animals, and all those herded with them, were slaughtered, and by those means the disease was stamped out; and it has not since been introduced.

9894. Then, by strict measures, they did stamp it out, as they have done on certain occasions in Denmark and Schleswig-Holstein?—Exactly, and as you may easily do in any country when it is newly introduced.

9895. With regard to pleuro-pneumonia, have you any records showing how that has been affected by the regulations which have been in force this year?—Pleuro-pneumonia has not been apparently affected at all by the action which has been taken, at any rate in the boroughs, where the disease is most rife. In

Chairman—continued.

London it has been more prevalent than it has been probably for some years previously; I speak here quite without reference to the returns which we get in the Veterinary Department, which certainly do not include anything like one-half of the actual number of outbreaks which really occur; but I happen to know from a very reliable witness that there has been more disease in London than there has been for some years previously.

9896. During the time that these strict regulations have been in force?—Yes.

9897. Then I suppose you would say that the opinion which has been expressed by a witness before this Committee, that pleuro-pneumonia could be extirpated in six months, could hardly be well-grounded?—Without knowing precisely what method would be adopted it would of course be difficult to give an opinion; but having before me the example of Holland and Switzerland, I confess I do not see what practical means could be adopted which would succeed in eradicating that disease in six months. In Switzerland, for some years past, most severe measures of repression have been adopted, and we frequently get a report that the country is declared free, and the following month we get a report of a fresh outbreak in the same district, or in another canton. In Holland, the measures which have been adopted for the last six years were of so severe a character that they would hardly have been thought of in this country. The importation of cattle was prohibited in 1870; the slaughter of diseased animals has been compulsory since 1872; and in 1874 inoculation was made compulsory, with the alternative of the slaughter of the animals which were herded with diseased ones. This year the slaughter of animals which had been herded with diseased ones has been carried out actively; and the result has been that, from 1870 to the first six months of 1877, they are able to report that they have got rid of the disease in one province.

9898. That is in Friesland?—That is in Friesland.

9899. Was there not a distinction in Mr. May's evidence as between those regulations; did he not say that the attempt to absolutely stamp out the disease, by slaughter, in Friesland had only been adopted within the last year?—He had reference, I believe, to the slaughter of animals which were herded with the diseased ones; that is to say, the slaughter of the entire herd; that, I believe, has only been carried on during the first part of 1877, but the slaughter of diseased animals was ordered in 1872.

9900. It was in reference to the last increasedly severe restriction that he quoted the diminution of cases of disease in the province of Friesland, was it not?—It was.

9901. Whilst they had attempted by inoculation, and by slaughter of the animal itself that was affected, to get rid of it witout success, he quoted that as showing that they were in one province, where they adopted the more severe measures practically succeeding?—That was so; and I may say that on that system it is conceivable that one might get rid of pleuro-pneumonia in six weeks without waiting for six months. I mean that if, by a species of jugglery, one should be allowed to find out every spot where pleuro-pneumonia existed, and you then extirpated the

Chairman—continued.

the entire herd, you would get rid of pleuro-pneumonia by the simple expedient of destroying all the susceptible animals; but I do not apprehend that that is a proposition which would be seriously suggested.

9902. It is not one, at all events, which you think would be adopted willingly by the farmers of this country?—Clearly not.

9903. With regard to the restriction as to the import of animals for the purpose of stopping the introduction of pleuro-pneumonia, there also you think that very strict home regulations must be combined with it, or we should not get rid of that disease any more than they have after having prohibited import in the Netherlands?—I think that the whole history of the affection on the Continent proves that that must be the case.

9904. And that it must be enforced by regulations which you have described as being far more severe than anything which we have ever contemplated in this country?—Decidedly. The restrictions to which I have referred have added to them a number of details which I have not quoted; such as power to stop markets, registration of cattle in various districts, and such an amount of interference as no one in this country has ever contemplated.

9905. To some extent similar to those which are now suggested for adoption in Germany?—Even more severe.

9906. You have dealt with pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease; and with regard to cattle plague, that, I suppose, you would consider could be dealt with by strict regulations as to import, keeping in reserve any regulations with regard to home stock until it should come over to this country?—Certainly; I think we should secure ouselves, humanly speaking, completely, by prohibiting, as I suggested to the Committee before, imports of cattle from Germany and Belgium, and from France, unless France chose to adopt the necessary precautions to guard her frontier.

9907. Germany, on account of her proximity to a contaminated frontier, and Belgium on account of her being a transit country?—Exactly.

9908. With regard to the question of inspection, it has been given in evidence before this Committee that our present system of inspection is not to be relied upon; and I think one of the witnesses, Mr. Robinson, in his evidence, made some complaint as to inspection not being worth very much as a protection against the introduction of disease; do you wish to make any remark with regard to that?—I think it must be admitted by anyone who examines the returns relating to the diseased animals which are detected on landing that, at any rate, a certain amount of advantage is gained by the inspection of animals after a certain period of detention. Were it not for some such safeguard it is quite clear that a very large number of diseased animals, amounting in the last two years to something like 30,000, would have got into the country; whereas they were stopped, with all the animals which had been in contact with them, and were slaughtered at the port. I think that Mr. Robinson's complaints had reference to the want of uniformity; and I find, on looking over the papers in the Veterinary Department, that Mr. Robinson has complained on several occasions in reference to the different

Chairman—continued.

systems which he alleges are adopted at London and at Harwich. In March 1874 Mr. Robinson reported to the Veterinary Department that a cargo of cattle *ex* Rotterdam had been passed at Harwich before the 12 hours' daylight detention had expired.

9909. What was done in that case?—An inquiry was made, and it was found that most of the animals had been detained for more than 13 hours. The detention for 12 hours' daylight is not suggested or required by the terms of the Order; the injunction is that the inspector is not to make his final examination except during daylight; but if it were insisted that the animals should be detained for 12 hours' daylight, it would happen, in some periods of the year, that they could not be allowed to go; for some months there are many consecutive days when there are not 12 hours' daylight.

9910. I suppose that detention for 12 hours after inspection is intended to secure two inspections before the animal is declared free?—It is, and also to secure that the animals remain for 12 hours after the landing of the last animal of the cargo.

9911. But I suppose you would admit that an inspection by daylight is almost necessary to enable an inspector to detect disease?—We conceived that to be absolutely necessary, and therefore we gave the order.

9912. Then if two inspections are required to give sufficient security, ought not both those inspections to be by daylight?—The requirement does not absolutely necessitate two inspections. The inspector is presumed to look round the animals when they are first landed, or as soon after as he possibly can, in order that if there are any cases of a very decided character he may at once act; but the great object of the 12 hours' detention is that the animals may be quiet and cool when he makes the real crucial inspection.

9913. You would represent that there is not the same necessity for his being able to detect the disease when the animals first come off the vessel as there is when he finally declares them sound?—There is not the same opportunity. The animals are very often, at the time of landing, not in a condition which would enable the inspector to detect whether they were suffering from disease or from extreme exhaustion.

9914. Supposing that cattle arrive at such a time that they can only in the first instance be inspected in the dark; that a large number of those animals, we will say, are affected, that some of them escape the notice of the inspector, being landed in the dark, that people come in contact with them and spread the disease, and that as soon as the daylight examination comes, the inspector at once condemns the cargo; does not that open the door to great risk?—That is undoubtedly a difficulty which is absolutely insurmountable under the present arrangements.

9915. Unless some inspection were made by daylight?—And even then, unless we prohibited tha landing of animals except during daylight, there would still be the risk of the diseased animals coming in contact with the attendants, and the attendants would have the opportunity of going away without any notice being taken, and before the disease was really discovered.

9916. Was that the only case in which the Privy Council had their attention called to this

by

Professor *Brown.*

6 July 1877.

Chairman—continued.

by Mr. Robinson.—No; in another case, in October 1874, Mr. Robinson reported that cattle *ex* "Avaton" from Rotterdam landed at Harwich had been passed after sunset. This, of course, suggested that the animals had been inspected after dark; and if this had been proved, the inspector would without question have been removed from his post. The case was inquiried into, and it was found that the last animal of the cargo was landed, and in the lairs a quarter of an hour before the time at which Mr. Robinson stated that the vessel had arrived at Harwich. Mr. Robinson grounded his complaint upon the statement that the vessel had arrived at such an hour that 12 hours' detention, from even the time of the arrival of the vessel, would have taken them beyond sunset, the fact being, that all the animals were in the sheds before the hour at which Mr. Robinson stated that the vessel had brought up her cargo to the wharf.

9917. Was the time of the arrival of the vessel ascertained by a custom house certificate?—It was; and by the statement of the persons who had been engaged at the landing; but the evidence upon which we rely in those cases is the evidence of the custom house officers, who are bound to see to the clearing of the vessel.

9918. What struck me most, and I daresay struck the Committee most, in the examination of Mr. Robinson, was a statement showing the discrepancy between the authorities at the London waterside markets and at Harwich; inasmuch as it was alleged, that at the London landing-place a number of cargoes were condemned, and yet that brother cargoes, if I may so call them, coming from the same port and from the same centre, and going to Harwich, were all left free; has your attention been called to that?—That complaint was made in August 1875. Mr. Robinson called attention to the fact that nine cargoes out of 15 had been stopped at London, whereas 12 cargoes landed at Harwich had been passed. He inferred from this, that a difference of practice existed at Harwich and at London, and he stated that he had heard that the inspector at Harwich stopped the diseased animals only, whilst at London the healthy ones were detained as well as the diseased ones. I may say at once, that we knew those complaints to be unfounded, because the inspector was one of the most experienced we have, and he knew perfectly well what his duties were. Nevertheless inquiry was made, and the evidence went clearly to show that the practice was the same at both ports; that when disease was detected at Harwich, the healthy animals were slaughtered as they would be in London. The discrepancy in the results of the inspection we could not account for, excepting that we were informed that the very greatest care was exercised by the Great Eastern Company to obtain animals from healthy sources, and that, having before them the inconvenience of their being stopped at Harwich, they took care to use every precaution to bring only healthy animals into the market. On the same subject of the want of uniformity in the method of inspection, we had a complaint from the Great Eastern Railway Company. They complained that the cattle trade was being entirely diverted from Harwich to London, on account of the different manner in which inspection was conducted at the two ports; and certain shippers and salesmen said that, as long as they could get their cattle passed at the London wharves, they would not risk sending them to Harwich, where they would be detained for slaughter. The complaint in this case was the exact opposite of the complaint in the other case, because Mr. Robinson's allegation was that all the cattle could get through at Harwich, and that they were stopped in London.

Chairman—continued.

9919. Were those complaints made at the same time?—No, but they refer to the same inspector; the same man has been at Harwich during the whole time; what I want to bring before the notice of Committee is the fact that the same inspector is charged with two different systems of action tending in opposite directions by two persons at different periods. In order to test this statement, the Great Eastern Company requested that they might be allowed to nominate a veterinary inspector for themselves to see what course was pursued in London; this request was complied with, and Mr. William Hunting was allowed to be present at the inspection of the cargoes at Brown's Wharf; Mr. Hunting attended on several occasions, and finally reported that he had no complaint to make. The Great Eastern Company wrote to the Veterinary Department in reference to the case, stating that they had no further observations to offer; and that was the conclusion of the whole matter so far as we were concerned.

9920. I think that Mr. Hunting was examined on that point before the Committee of 1873, was he not?—He was; and he stated the course which he had adopted on that occasion when he was temporarily employed by the Great Eastern Company to watch the inspection at Brown's Wharf; and I believe he was asked to hand in a report, but the report I find is not printed in the Appendix to the Committee's Report.

9921. You quote the instance of 1872, and the other of 1874, as showing that the inspector's judgment had, in both cases, been questioned from exactly opposite points of view, in fact; and that in each instance you satisfied yourself that there had been some mistake upon the subject?—That was the conclusion at which I arrived.

9922. In your inquiry as to the comparison of the healthy cargoes coming through in 1874, did you satisfy yourself on more than the statement of the inspector?—We had no very direct means of getting evidence, except that the animals go from Harwich to the London market, and they are again seen by the inspector there. In only one instance did it happen that diseased animals which had been passed by our inspector were detected with disease in the Metropolitan Market by Mr. Rayment, and the result of that discovery on his part was that the inspector of the Privy Council was immediately removed from his office.

9923. The allegation, as I understood it, was not that they sent forward cargoes without inspection, but that they separated animals from them, and sent forward what are called the healthy animals to the London market?—I think, in that case, that plan, if it had been adopted, would have defeated itself, because those animals would some of them certainly have shown the disease in the Metropolitan Market.

9924. From having been in contact with the others?

Chairman—continued.

others?—From having been in contact with the others.

9925. But at the same time there was no evidence taken in regard to it, excepting the evidence of the inspector who was accused?—No, there was no other evidence that could be obtained.

9926. Your attention has, of course, been directed to a suggestion of one witness with regard to the inspection, viz., that our English inspectors might be placed at foreign ports; have you considered that point?—That suggestion has been repeatedly made during the last 10 years, and I have always opposed the idea on the plea that it would practically throw the whole responsibility upon the Privy Council; it would invariably be said when diseased animals were landed: "Your inspector was at the port, and he ought to have prevented it;" the mere fact of his not having any such power would, I am quite certain, not be taken into account.

9927. You mean to say that the foreign inspector would relieve himself practically of the responsibility on account of the English inspector being there to certify as to the disease?—Clearly he would have the opportunity of so doing.

9928. And you do not think that the advantage which was suggested, which would be that the man would say, "I shall report your cargo if you do not take more care about it, and therefore you will have it stopped when it goes over," would compensate for that?—No, I think the whole result of that system would be probable that rather more diseased animals might by weeded out of the cargoes on the other side before they were shipped; but I would myself prefer that that should not be done at all; it is already done more than I should wish. I should prefer that they should ship the diseased animals rather than keep them back, because there is a greater risk that animals which have been herded with diseased ones may escape.

9929. That especially applies to pleuro-pneumonia, I suppose?—Certainly; and even to foot-and-mouth disease. We know that the practice is to remove diseased animals on the wharves at the other side, and to charter a special ship to take them all to Deptford afterwards.

9930. Have you considered whether any change should be made in the regulations affecting the landing places, in consequence of what has been pointed out with regard to the difficulties that at present exist in preventing the spread of disease?—I see no practical way of very much improving the arrangements at the landing places without totally altering our present system. I think anything like security could only be obtained by having special vessels, bringing them into particular ports, detaining the vessels and the persons in charge of the animals, until they were ascertained to be perfectly healthy; and then, when necessary, adopting a proper system of disinfection, both for the cattle men and for the vessels in which the cattle are brought.

9931. That is what you suggested, I think, in your first examination?—I did.

9932. And that would meet, I think, what Mr. Read in his evidence complained of, which was that the vessel was not disinfected for some time after the cattle had been landed?—It would meet that difficulty. I may further add that longer detention of animals landed in this country would, of course, give an increased opportunity to the inspectors to detect disease in those in which the disease was only in a state of incubation; I refer particularly to foot-and-mouth disease.

Chairman—continued.

9933. If you had the power which you suggest, that would prevent what Mr. Read also mentioned, viz., a vessel getting away, as it did in this case, I think, to Limehouse, where she would probably spread the disease in the London area?—She would.

9934. Mr. Read stated that it took some considerable time, I think, before any impression was made upon the Privy Council upon that subject, in reference to the disinfecting of this vessel, and its getting away to Limehouse and spreading the disease?—I think he referred on that point to the difficulty which was found in inducing the Privy Council to take charge of those places where cattle plague existed.

9935. It was with regard to your powers over the metropolitan area?—It was so, I think.

9936. Was it the case that it was a long time before it was done, and that great pressure, by deputations and otherwise, had to be put upon the Privy Council to do it?—It was not until the middle of April that the Privy Council passed an order to enable their officers to act in the metropolitan police district; and although suggestions had been previously made, I do not at this moment recollect any deputation that came to press that point particularly, excepting the one from the Royal Agricultural Society and from the Shorthorn Society. Suggestions had been made, but there was a disinclination to take the matter out of the hands of the local authority, into whose hands it was given by the Act, until there was reason to apprehend that they had not the machinery to prevent the disease from spreading to the country.

9937. That, I presume, would strengthen your suggestion that the Privy Council should be the central authority, with general powers throughout the country?—I think it does.

9938. Going back to the question of inspection, is there anything that you would wish to suggest on the evidence which has been given with regard to the inspection of Irish animals?—On the subject of the inspection of animals landed from Ireland I should like to state to the Committee that there was, from the first, some little difficulty felt in appointing men to examine animals on various parts of the coast from the conviction that we should probably convey to the public mind a totally wrong impression. As a matter of fact, we have no more power to deal with Irish animals than we have to deal with English animals, and no inspector has the right to stop an animal on a landing place and examine it, unless he has reason to suspect certain diseases; whereas, by placing an inspector at a port where Irish animals were landed, we seemed to suggest that we meant to deal with those animals as if they were animals landed from abroad, the real truth being that we had no intention of the kind.

9939. Have you any power of detention or otherwise?—We have no power whatever to detain the animals for a moment. If the owner chose to drive them away whilst the inspector was standing there, the inspector has no right to attempt to prevent him.

Professor *Brown.*

6 July 1877.

Chairman—continued.

9940. The impression left on my mind, looking at the clauses of the Act, was that one clause in the Act gives the Government Inspector all the powers of the local inspector, and that the local inspector has the power of stopping the animals landed, if disease is detected?—Yes; if he detects the disease, he has power under the 57th section, to detain the animal; supposing that it is driven along a public road, or exposed in any public place, he has power to detain it, and take it to any convenient place, and keep it there for the necessary time.

9941. It seemed to me, looking at the combination of those two clauses in the Act, and with reference to the statement that was made, that a Government Inspector at Bristol, had been present during the whole time of the landing of the cargo on the highway, and had seen the infected animals which he pointed out to the witness landed, and then driven along that highway, those two clauses practically did give him power, as Government Inspector, to stop those animals?—It did under those circumstances.

9942. Nevertheless, the inspector had told the gentleman with him, that he had no such power, and that his instructions from the central office gave him none?—The instructions which I gave all the inspectors when they were appointed, were definitely as he stated, that they were not to do anything beyond reporting the disease to the local authority, and to the Privy Council; they were particularly to avoid interfering with the action of the local authorities.

9943. Then it really results in this: that it was by instructions from the central office that the powers that might have been given to the Government Inspector under the Act were limited?—It was so for the obvious reason that if we had instructed our inspectors to go down to Bristol and take the action of the inspectors of the local authority, we must also have found a convenient place in which to keep the animals; because under such conditions the local authority's inspector would naturally have said, "You have taken charge of the animals; you must keep them; I have nothing more to do with it."

9944. That points rather to a defect in the existing regulations, does it not, because we might infer from that that there is very little utility in keeping a Government Inspector at all at the port, if under his nose animals were passing diseased into the country?—The only advantage was that by having a Government officer at the places where the larger portion of the animals from Ireland were landed, the local authorities might be informed of the existence of disease, and the Government might also be put into possession of knowledge which could be utilised under certain conditions.

9945. He is not one of your travelling inspectors who examines as to the conditions of the transit of the animals?—No; there are two men at Bristol now who are both exclusively employed in attending to the landing of animals coming from Ireland.

9946. For the purpose of giving information to the central authority if disease comes in in the cargoes?—Solely with that view: they were told not to exercise the powers which they could technically claim, because they have no machinery for the purpose of carrying them out.

9947. Therefore the system is complicated in this way, that probably the only man who sees the diseased animal at all, has first to get the local inspector from Bristol down to the port, and then the local inspector sets the machinery of the Act in operation?—Or the policeman who regularly attends.

Chairman—continued.

9948. But the policeman cannot do it under the instructions of the Government Inspector, but has to wait for the instructions of the local inspector?—He has general instructions from the local authority, and therefore he is an officer empowered on their behalf to take possession of animals that are landed diseased, and the arrangement is that they are taken to a slaughter-house, but he has no power at all to take them to a slaughter-house.

9949. Of course under your instructions the local inspector informs the local authority at once of each case of disease that he sees?—The course which is adopted is this:—As the animals are landed the inspector stands by, and if he detects disease he has the animal caught; he exceeds his power so far as to order the drover to hold it, so that he can examine it; having satisfied himself that it has disease, he points out the animal to a policeman; and the rule is, I believe, that the policeman gets the animal driven to a slaughter-house, and in some way it is contrived that the animal shall be slaughtered. But I could not ascertain how it was done; it certainly cannot be done legally without the consent of the owner.

9950. We had some evidence which rather astonished, I think, some members of the Committee, that an inspector was present and saw the diseased animals landed at this port; and the gentleman who gave the evidence, and who was with him, said that no policeman carried them away for slaughter, but that they were put into carts, not being able to walk, and were taken along the highway into the country; and that the other animals that were with them, which were apparently unaffected, were driven off as a matter of course into the country; and that the inspector stood by and pointed out the diseased animals to the gentleman who was with him, and said, "Those are infected with disease;" and he had no power to stop them?—I have no doubt that that is a literally accurate statement of what took place. It is what would take place under ordinary circumstances. Those animals must have been pigs; carts are always ready, not for the purpose of taking away diseased pigs, but for the purpose of taking away pigs that are injured, as they constantly are by scrambling over each other and scratching each other on the voyage, and even by being washed with the sea water, which causes intense irritation of the skin of the pig. When foot-and-mouth disease occurs amongst the pigs, our inspector points out the animals to the policeman, and under his direction they are put into carts and taken away to a large slaughter-house in the borough; but having got to that slaughter-house there is no one, so far as I can ascertain, whose duty it is to see that they are slaughtered; in fact there is no power on the part of anybody to see that such slaughter does take place.

9951. All that points to the necessity of some alteration in the existing system?—Yes.

9952. There is no power to slaughter home animals

Chairman—continued.

animals for foot-and-mouth disease, is there?—None whatever.

9953. Although there is for pneumonia?—Yes, but that only under an Order that was passed some time ago for the purpose of ordering slaughter, and not under the Act. I may say that these circumstances strengthen the objections which I entertained from the first to the appointment of inspectors at Irish ports, namely, that we should convey to the public a wrong impression. These men would be required to see diseased animals landed, and see them driven away, unless the policeman likes to take charge of them; and I must say I am very much surprised that no complaints have been made by the public before this time.

9954. Then you are confirmed in your opinion that the system is faulty in that respect?—I believe the system attains exactly the object which was intended, namely, that we should be informed of cases which would otherwise never come to our knowledge; and the local authorities are informed of such cases, and I believe the mistake has been that the public has not been made sufficiently aware that the whole duty of our inspectors, at ports where Irish animals are landed, is to detect disease and to report it, and not to act as the inspectors of the local authority.

9955. We have some evidence as to the arrangements that attend this trade in Bristol and that part; have you recently examined into those arrangements?—I remained in Bristol during the last two days, and I saw some hundreds of cattle, sheep, and pigs landed; I traced them into the market, and I saw them put into the lairs and the trucking pens on the railway; and I saw them packed into trucks, and I saw some of them taken away; so that I have seen the whole process, as I had seen it repeatedly before.

9956. Were those cattle, sheep, and pigs?—Cattle and sheep. Nearly all the pigs are driven away, either directly to the railway station to go to Calne, or to the large slaughter-houses to which I have previously referred; a large number of them are slaughtered in the borough.

9957. Has there been any improvement in recent times in the arrangements?—There is undoubtedly a very considerable improvement on the landing place. The arrangements are by no means perfect, but there are large stone divisions put up so that cargoes can be kept separate, and there is no longer that driving and shouting, and excitement which there used to be; and there are also water troughs, though they are not sufficient in number, and are not sufficiently supplied with water; and there are a few pens which are not yet finished, where the water troughs are entirely empty. But those are only matters of detail, to which I called the attention of the local authority; and the town clerk has promised to put the necessary pressure upon the dock company to have these things attended to at once; and I have no doubt that they will be done. However, the arrangements for dividing cargoes, and for cleansing, and for disinfection, are certainly, comparatively speaking, satisfactory, considering that no one gets any dues for the landing, and that company or individual is absolutely bound to do anything at all, except to provide water on the landing place.

9958. It was stated I think in evidence, that

Chairman—continued.

animals were constantly lost on this voyage; did you see the landing of any animals, and did you observe in what condition they came over?—They all came in what is called fresh condition; there were certainly none of them exhausted on the landing place, but, as usually happens when a large number of young stock, yearlings and two-year-olds, are driven into a vessel, they were excessively dirty; a large number of them had evidently been rolling about on each other, and they were completely covered with manure; but there was nothing that one could complain of under the circumstances. The losses were practically *nil.* I found that in one vessel there were 836 cattle, 517 sheep, and 154 pigs; in another vessel there were 75 cattle, 646 sheep, and 147 pigs; in another vessel there were 950 cattle, and 248 sheep; and the only animal landed dead was one sheep, which was brought on board the boat that had the smallest cargo.

9959. Are the fittings of those ships improved?—They are fitted quite in accordance with the directions of the Order, and they are all of them very effectually cleansed and disinfected before they leave the port; all the regular trading vessels are disinfected at Bristol by contract.

9960. Are the vessels employed for that particular trade, or do they bring mixed cargoes?—They all bring mixed cargoes and passengers.

9961. I think Sir Alexander Wood, talking of that, was strongly in favour of the separation of the carriage of animals from the carriage of passengers; what is your view as to that?—There is no doubt that a very great advantage would arise from the universal adoption of that system. That has been suggested constantly.

9962. Do you think that the scheme that was suggested by Sir Alexander Wood is one that could be put in force?—I am afraid that it is not practicable, because it would necessitate very large landing places and somewhat expensive arrangements on board the boats; but if it could be carried out, there is no question at all that it would contribute very largely to the comfort of the animals.

9963. Practically, it has been to a very great extent carried out on one side of the water, at Cork, I believe?—I am not sure that it has been carried out at Cork.

9964. As far as the arrangements with regard to the carriage and shipment of the animals are concerned, has it not been carried out?—It has been carried out at one of the southern ports, but at this moment I am not quite clear which.

9965. You have described the condition in which you found the landing places, and the condition of the water supply, and other details; what were the steps taken there beyond what we have heard as to the Government Inspectors, reporting the detection of disease?—The two inspectors were on the landing place when I arrived, and they were both engaged in looking round the animals. It would have been simply impossible to inspect each one separately, and whilst I was there I must confess that if I had been called upon to certify that the animals were all free from foot-and-mouth disease, I should simply have declined to do it, not because I had reason to suspect that any of them had the disease, but because I could get no evidence to the contrary from the kind of examination which

was

Professor *Brown.*

6 July 1877.

Chairman—continued.

was possible under the circumstances. The animals all looked to be in good health, but beyond that it would have been impossible for me to go.

9966. In your opinion there was no sufficient inspection of the animals to enable you to guarantee them as being sound?—There cannot possibly be unless the animals are kept for a certain time in a proper place, and taken individually and examined carefully. Under the present system of inspecting Irish stock, only those animals which, with the commonest care on the other side of the water, never ought to have been shipped at all, can possibly be detected by our inspectors.

9967. With regard to any animals which are not really seriously affected, but which may have the disease still in them, and may in fact be liable to become centres of that disease, there is no real inspection?—None at all.

9968. Have you anything to suggest with regard to modifying the order as regards this disinfecting?—I think, if we are to deal with the subject of the transit of animals effectually, it would be necessary to give the Privy Council larger powers than it has. We ought to be able to say, in reference to any particular lairs or landing-place, that certain things are necessary, and unless they are done within a certain reasonable time, I think the Lord President should have power to forbid the use of those places for the intended purpose. I refer, as an example, to some lairs, or, as they are called, pens or inclosed spaces belonging to the Great Western Railway Company. The disinfection of trucks at that station, and the disinfection of the landing pens is quite satisfactory. So far as I am aware, all reasonable care is taken in trucking the animals; I saw them driven in; they were driven in quietly enough, but whether they would have been driven in so quietly if I had not been there, I cannot, of course, say. They were not packed more closely than animals usually are packed for the convenience of carriage, and in order to prevent them from falling down; but the large space in which they are kept before they are trucked is certainly quite unfit for the purpose. It has no flooring which could be disinfected by any known process, or even fairly cleansed; it is simply a collection of mud and, as it was yesterday, dust. The troughs are so placed that the animals may be easily driven by them; one large trough was perfectly dry, and certainly one quarter full of large stones, and the other one contained very little water. Whilst I stood there a number of animals, which probably had not tasted water for 24 hours were driven into the pens and shut up just within sight of the water trough, but certainly not within reach of it. When I pointed this out to the agent, the stones were cleared out very rapidly and the trough was instantly filled; but whilst I was there there were no animals in a position in which they could get at the water; they were all shut up in other compartments.

9969. In fact, in your opinion, fuller powers are required to deal with this question of transit?—Decidedly.

9970. And to deal with the proper regulation of the lairage and watering of animals when landed?—Quite so.

Chairman—continued.

9971. And also with the inspection?—That is my conviction.

9972. In this, I understand you to refer to the question of those ports where the animals are landed; have you also looked to the case of the railway trucks, and the carriage by railroad?—The last case to which I referred, was with regard to railway trucks and railway pens.

9973. The same additional power would be required in your opinion, to deal with the railroad and the carriage by rail, as with the carriage by steamers, and the lairage at the port of debarkation?—I think so; in this particular case, there is just the space that would be required for a very excellent depôt.

9974. You say that you think the Privy Council powers should be enlarged; are there not powers under the existing Act, for dealing with the transit by rail?—We find those powers insufficient in reference to these inclosed spaces, and in other similar spaces over the country. Our inspectors have reported constantly, that the places were not in a condition to be properly cleansed and disinfected. Some railway companies have paved those spaces; others say that they are not prepared to go to the expense, and others have gone so far as to say they would pull down the palings and make the inclosed spaces open spaces rather than do anything for the purpose.

9975. In fact, your powers are insufficient to enable you to deal with the matter, and it would require an amending Act to enable you to deal with it?—I think so.

9976. I think Lord Fitzhardinge in his evidence states, that the animals were smuggled into the country, but there is no law at present preventing their being landed anywhere, is there?—None, whatever; the term could not be properly applied to the landing of Irish cattle, because a man has as much right to land an Irish ox on any space of ground where there is room for his feet, as he has to land a dog or a cat.

9977. Therefore the fact which has been described in evidence of animals being landed at a small port up the River Severn, and then driven back to the Bristol market is quite within the powers that they have at present?—Quite; they probably did it for the purpose of evading inspection; but it seems to me that they have as much right to evade inspection if they can do it easily, as they have to submit to it.

9978. But it points, does it not, to the necessity, if you are to set up these restrictions, of some regulation defining the places where those restrictions exist, and where the animals should be landed?—Yes, certainly; and I think in common fairness those restrictions should be applied not only to Ireland but to the whole of the kingdom. I should deal as severely with animals from Ireland as with those from Scotland; the only difference would be that I should have more difficulty in catching them, because they go by railway from Aberdeen to London. It is the mere accident of the animals having to cross the channel that gives us an opportunity of seeing in what condition they are.

9979. You mean that if animals were sent by sea from Scotland they should be only landed at certain ports where the regulations could be looked after?—Certainly.

9980. And that the railway regulations should apply

Chairman—continued.

apply as much to one part of the country as to another?—Certainly.

9981. That is to say, that all your regulations should really apply to the United Kingdom?—Undoubtedly.

9982. And for the purpose of enforcing those regulations, strong restrictions as to the port of landing would be absolutely necessary?—Unquestionably. The Committee probably are aware that on two or three occasions the local authorities have acted on the information given by our inspectors, and have made regulations under the Order to prohibit the movement of animals that had been herded with diseased ones. It was done at Silloth, and I believe at Milford. The result was that the Irish Government complained that they were being treated exceptionally; that we were dealing with Irish cattle in a manner totally different from the way in which we were dealing with Scotch and Welsh cattle.

9983. I understood you to say that any regulations that are enforced should be for the United Kingdom?—Unquestionably.

9984. There was one other point in Lord Fitzhardinge's, or his steward's evidence, in which it was stated that half the fine went, on conviction, to the local inspectors; is that a system which you think satisfactory?—To me it is an objectionable system; but I presume that anyone who chooses to inform against a man who is illegally driving diseased animals can claim half the penalty. The question was raised by one of our inspectors on one occasion; he was engaged in a prosecution which was successful, and it seems that, as a matter of course, he expected half the penalty, and he applied for it; but the result of that application was that an instruction was sent to all our inspectors cautioning them that no such application should ever be made, and that if half the penalty were offered to them, they were not to be permitted to take it.

9985. The Privy Council has shown its sense of that being an ill-advised mode of proceeding by forbidding your own inspectors to accept half the fine for conviction?—The Privy Council took that course.

9986. You have referred to the necessity of severe restrictions with regard to our home trade, and to the difficulty, in your opinion, of enforcing these restrictions in the country; has your attention been called to the fact that many witnesses before this Committee, representing largely the agricultural interest in the country, have stated that they believe that the farmers generally would be prepared to submit to such regulations; and that, if objections to them were felt, they would be objections raised by dealers, and what they called jobbers, I think, rather than by the farmers themselves?—After having read or heard all the evidence which was given up to last Wednesday, I come to the conclusion that the difficulty which I anticipated as to enforcing restrictions over the whole country is rather confirmed than modified. For example, I find that Mr. Sheldon, Mr. Rea, and Mr. Jacob Wilson are all in favour of restrictions; and they state that the farmers of the country would submit to them; Mr. Stratton stated that the farmers would be prepared to submit to the regulations suggested by the central chamber, which is a very modified approval, indeed; Mr. Lambert, as I gathered from his evidence, was quite against any such severe resirictions.

Chairman—continued.

9987. Mr. Lambert was not speaking from an agricultural point of view, but as a salesman?—Quite so. Mr. Soulby was also against restrictions, and Mr. Howard, who is a very high authority in the matter, stated it as his conviction that a large number of inspectors would not be required, that a very short time would suffice to get rid of foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia, and that the police system, that is to say, the local authority system, would work very effectively. Professor Gamgee, speaking as a veterinary authority on the subject, states definitely that the restrictions are not required; that foot-and-mouth disease would die out in less than a year if we did not reintroduce it; and that he should consider any one unfit for the work who could not get rid of pleuro-pneumonia in six months. With those statements before me, I still entertain the conviction that the restrictions which I think necessary for the purpose of stamping out those diseases, would not be submitted so without very strong opposition.

9988. You are more inclined to agree with what Mr. Soulby, as representing the East Riding of Yorkshire, stated than with the other witnesses on the point?—I am.

9989. It was pointed out by one of those witnesses that the restrictions would not be necessarily enforced in the whole country, but that by setting out infected areas you would practically be only producing those inconveniences in a much more limited space, and that in their opinion you would not effect the same result?—That would, of course, depend upon the state of the prevalence of the disease, if any system of the kind which I suggest could be adopted at this moment without any delay, we probably might succeed in arresting the progress of these affections by a modified course, dealing only with certain counties or with certain districts; but when the disease is extensively spread over the country, I do not see that anything could be done in the first instance short of stopping the whole cattle trade, and allowing fairs and markets to take place only by license.

9990. I understood you to say in the earlier part of your evidence to-day that disease, so far as foot-and-mouth disease goes, had certainly diminished under restrictions which were not uniform throughout the country, but which were applicable only to part of the country?—That is the case; but the restrictions affected a considerable number of fairs and markets, and the metropolis was shut up. The cases which were beginning to be numerous in the Metropolitan Market were at once stopped short; and consequently hundreds of infected animals, which would have been sent into the country, were kept and slaughtered in London.

9991. I think I understood you to say that in your original scheme, if those restrictions were enforced, they could only be carried out, in your opinion, by all the inspectors throughout the country being attached to the central authority?—I certainly think that they would have to be in some way attached to the central authority before any effective action could be taken.

9992. We have had one witness from Scotland who suggested that you might arrive at the same end by appointing, as the Local Government

Professor *Brown.*

6 July 1877.

Chairman—continued.

Board do in their poor-law cases, a number of travelling inspectors, who should "pounce down," as he described it, upon different areas, and see that the local inspector appointed by the locality was really carrying out the regulations issued from the central authority; have you considered that suggestion?—I think I have a case here which will clearly show that it would not be sufficient. It happened some time ago that I saw an animal which Mr. Rayment, the market inspector, had seized in the Metropolitan Market; that was in February; the return is dated February 5th. That animal was slaughtered, and the disease of the lungs was so marked that I sent the whole specimen down to Professor Simonds, in order that he might lecture upon it to the pupils. I asked the owner of the animal how many more he had in his shed, and he told me 19, or some such number; from 16 to 19. I immediately telegraphed to the town clerk of Bedford, from which place this animal had been sent, and informed him of the fact that a diseased animal, taken from Mr. So-and-So's shed, was seized in the Metropolitan Market. On February 15th, we had the following letter: "In reply to a letter of the 9th instant, I have to state that the inspector of this borough, on receiving information of the removal of the cow from the premises named, inspected on the 7th instant eight cows in a shed." That suggested to me at once that between the 5th of February and the 7th, the owner, warned by what had happened in the Metropolitan Market, had reduced the number of animals in his shed from the number which he had stated to me down to eight. The eight animals were found to be apparently well. On March the 7th we got a report from the inspector at Bedford to the effect that on the same premises there were "eight cows, five attacked with pleuro-pneumonia, slaughtered by order of the local authority, three remaining healthy." In that particular case the discovery of the disease was made; there was no question about it; we ascertained the locality. I should have telegraphed, if I had had the power, to the inspector of that district to tell him to apply the pleuro-pneumonia rules to those premises, so that no animal could be moved without a license, and then only for the purpose of slaughter; and the owner would not have had the opportunity of sending a number of infected animals about the country, which he could legally do under the present system.

9993. That is supposing that the inspection had been all under your own control?—Exactly.

9994. You do not think the local authority would carry out the regulations uniformly under a fear of any neglect being detected by a visit of the travelling inspector?—No; because in a case of this kind the only effective action must have been taken by means of the telegraph. Before the owner got back to his premises they would have been in charge of the local inspector under the direction of the Privy Council. In this case, I do not accuse anybody of doing anything wrong; the local authorities did all that they could do, and the owner did what he had a right to do.

9995. You do not think that the system which was suggested by a Scotch witness of telegraphing to the inspector of the local authority, and

Chairman—continued.

pointing out what had occurred, would have the same effect; and that, in order to prevent the central authority taking action against him, he would do what this man did not do?—In this case he did not. If we could obtain power to direct what we consider necessary by telegraphing to the local officer, that would be very much the system which I suggest.

9996. And it might be carried out, perhaps, without such an interference with the appointment of the inspectors as your original suggestion proposed?—Yes, it could undoubtedly.

9997. There has been a question raised, and there have been some conflicting statements as to the total loss by disease in this country; have you had your attention directed to those statements?—It has been a subject of discussion since the outbreak of cattle plague in 1865, and I am not aware that there are any reliable statistics on the subject. I may say that the estimation of loss from the returns of the insurance societies is palpably a fallacious system; because when a a society proposes to insure against losses from pleuro-pneumonia, its chief supporters are those persons who expect to have pleuro-pneumonia, such as the dairymen of large towns; and naturally, under those conditions, all the insurance societies were ruined very quickly. But I should like to state to the Committee what the loss really amounts to on the assumption that we lose 5 per cent. of our cattle every year from various diseases, including contagious diseases and others. Taking 5,846,302 cattle as the average, 5 per cent. of loss will amount to 292,315. Comparing that loss with the loss which occurred during the whole period of the prevalence of cattle plague, from 1865 to 1867, I find that we have, according to the reports, lost 278,943; which is something like 13,372 less than the alleged annual loss of cattle from various diseases. So that if that statement is true, we are annually losing, without any particular observation, more cattle every year than we lost during the whole time of the cattle plague. Then as to the further statement that 70 per cent. of the animals which are lost die from pleuro-pneumonia (I may say that I take the term "die" to include slaughter, because I presume that everybody knows that very few animals die of pleuro-pneumonia; they are all killed), that would give 204,620 every year. The total losses from pleuro-pneumonia, of which we have any knowledge in our statistics for the five years from 1872 to 1876, amounted to 33,569. The average for those five years would be 6,715. I do not presume to tell the Committee that that average loss is anything like the actual loss; I do not believe that we get at half of it; but the discrepancy between a loss of between 6,000 and 7,000 and a loss of 204,000 is something too enormous. It would suggest that our statistics are really not worth the paper that they are written upon.

9998. Therefore you infer that any facts derived from those calculations really do not represent the state of the case?—Certainly not, and I am perfectly clear that nothing like 70 per cent. of the total deaths or slaughter on account of disease can be referred to pleuro-pneumonia, considering the large number of fatal diseases, blood diseases, parasitic affections of young stock, and other maladies, which destroy large numbers every year, the losses during parturition in bad seasons.

Chairman—continued.

seasons. I am perfectly satisfied that pleuro-pneumonia does not account for anything like 70 per cent. of the total losses incurred.

9999. I understand you to say that you cannot rely upon any of those figures at all, and therefore I do not suppose that you could give us any figures upon which we could rely with regard to foot-and-mouth disease?—In conjunction with Professor Simonds, eight or ten years ago, I tried to arrive at an approach to the truth, and we came to the conclusion that the total losses of cattle from all diseases in this country could not exceed 1½ per cent.

10000. Do you mean that per-centage to apply to the whole stock of the country or to the death rate of the country?—Of the whole cattle of the country not more than 1½ per cent. die every year from various diseases, from all diseases.

10001. The death rate as compared to the stock in the country is only 1½ per cent.?—That is the conclusion to which we came; but I am bound to say that I do not attach much importance to that, because we had no proper data upon which to arrive at a proper conclusion.

10002. Were your calculations framed upon the whole of the animals, including cattle, sheep, and pigs?—No, they had reference to cattle.

10003. I gather from what you say, that you do not think that even that calculation was one which you yourself would wish to rely upon?—No, I should not be surprised to hear that it was totally wrong; but I should be very much surprised to hear that the total losses were 3 per cent., that is to say, double that amount.

10004. It has been stated by Mr. Odams, I think, that foot-and-mouth disease is prevalent in markets; is that confirmed by your own experience?—There is no doubt that foot-and-mouth disease is very frequently present in various markets, and certainly in the majority of markets no inspection of any kind takes place.

10005. We have heard, with regard to the Islington Market, a statement from Mr. Rudkin that in that market he believed the lairs were so impregnated that there was hardly ever any cessation of disease; is that in accordance with your own opinion?—It is. Excepting under special conditions during those periods when the decline of foot-and-mouth disease takes place, as it does about every two or three years, the disease is always present more or less in the markets; that is to say, it is always present in the markets when it exists to any large extent in the country.

10006. And the recent comparative cessation of it which you have described does not prove anything more than that is under conditions under which it has ceased in the country also?—The conditions in this case were that the animals were not sent; there were so many restrictions in the way of their being sent that they were kept from the market largely.

10007. Have you considered the suggestion that Mr. Rudkin made with regard to the necessity, in consequence of the almost certainty of that disease continuing in the lairs of the market, of restricting the market to an absolute slaughter market?—I believe that it would be a very desirable thing to do, but I see a great difficulty in ensuring the slaughter of all the animals which are sent there.

10008. Do you mean with regard to the difficulty of enforcing the penalties for not slaughtering animals branded in that market?—The difficulty is in branding them in such a way that the mark should not be readily obliterated, and the necessity for following the animals to a slaughter-house, or giving them in charge to some authority as soon as they arrived at their destination.

10009. You do not think that if heavy penalties were placed upon the exhibition in a market of animals branded in a particular way (which brand would of course be protected by heavy penalties on their being exhibited in other markets) that would practically effect the object?—Unless the penalties were very heavy (and then would arise the difficulty, because magistrates do not like to inflict heavy penalties for these offences), I do not think that the deterrent effect would be sufficient.

10010. I think that Mr. Odams stated that the American cattle which had been sent to Southampton have recently suffered from disease?—The inspector at Southampton reported some little time ago that a cargo of American cattle which had been landed had one or two animals in it which were suffering from some affection of the respiratory system, and that they had been killed, and he saw what he concluded to be evidence of some disease of the lungs. The chief inspector was immediately sent to Southampton; he saw a piece of the lung which was complained of, and another animal which gave evidence of some irritation in the breathing organs was killed, and he examined that carefully; but the disease was entirely confined to the windpipe, the upper part of the throat, and had no connection whatever with the disease of the lungs. There was nothing like inflammation, or congestion, or pleuro-pneumonia.

10011. It does not show that the American animals are not brought over in a healthy condition to this country?—No, not in the least. In this case there was no cause for suspicion at all.

10012. Of course your attention has been directed, in looking through the evidence, to the statements of the foreign witnesses with regard to the proposed restrictions which Germany intends to adopt for the purpose of protecting both themselves and the countries to which they export from those diseases?—It has.

10013. Has that led you to at all alter the opinion which you expressed before that evidence was given with reference to the German import?—I am still of opinion that if we wish to protect ourselves from cattle plague we must prohibit cattle from Germany and Belgium, at any rate, and probably from France, unless France will make certain regulations.

10014. You have not altered the opinion which you originally expressed upon the further information that we have had as to this protecting goal being established on her frontier, as to the regulations for the immediate stoppage of all markets from which animals could come to us, and as to the increased telegraphic facilities which they propose to adopt?—I do not doubt that those further regulations will very much tend to diminish the risk, but I do not believe that the confidence of the country will be restored, and I am certain that my own confidence in our safety would not be restored so long as we get live animals from German ports.

10015. Do you mean sheep as well as cattle?—Only

Professor *Brown.*

6 July 1877.

Chairman—continued.

—Only cattle, so far as cattle plague is concerned.

10016. With regard to other diseases, supposing that regulations are made here with a view of stamping them out, do you think that applies equally to those other diseases?—I think we could sufficiently well protect ourselves from other diseases, even by the scheme which I suggested, of allowing animals to come from countries where we have clear evidence that no foot-and-mouth disease or pleuro-pneumonia existed, and where the regulations were of such a nature that there was ground for the presumption that the animals would remain free; but if it is proposed to deal seriously with the diseases in this country, if, in short, we make up our minds to extirpate both foot-and-mouth diseases, and pleuro-pneumonia, then, seeing that this scheme was in course of adoption, I should certainly feel bound to prevent the introduction of disease by slaughtering animals of all kinds at the port of landing.

10017. Including even sheep? — Including everything; pigs, certainly, because they introduce disease more commonly than cattle.

10018. Have you any means of forming an opinion as to the statements which have been made that if that plan were adopted with regard to both sheep and cattle, that is to say, if they were slaughtered at the port, it would not necessarily interfere with the meat trade of the large towns, because it would be perfectly easy to carry the dead from those ports into the country, and that it was really being so carried now?—I am informed that the American dead-meat trade is falling off very rapidly at the present time, and that they seem to prefer bringing the live animals; but, speaking in the new light that has been thrown upon the subject by the American dead-meat trade, and with the fact before me that the meat can be brought in perfectly good condition, I have no doubt at all that we can, by adopting proper arrangements on this side, slaughter all the animals that are sent to us, and send them to any distance, certainly send them over the whole of this kingdom. But, for this purpose we must abandon what I may term the slovenly habits which are common with slaughtermen; we must have something like a proper system of dressing animals, and of gradually cooling them before they are packed.

10019. Supposing that that became a necessity, do you think that the trade would adopt those precautions for their own sakes?—I believe they would; and I may say that this is not at all a new idea in reference to the prevention of contagious disease. I have only by accident fallen upon a paper which I wrote in 1869 on foot-and-mouth disease, and, in speaking of the subject of prevention generally, I find this passage: "There remains one measure which will probably be deemed quite impracticable, but which would nevertheless tend more than any other to the extinction of contagious diseases, and greatly aid in the mitigation of unnecessary suffering; the general adoption of a system of traffic in dead meat instead of living animals." I wrote that quite without reference to the foreign trade, but merely with the fact before me that diseased and infected animals were constantly being moved about our own country.

10020. And you are of opinion now, as you were then, that really the greatest security against disease would be procured by the establishment of a dead-meat trade, and that, from the possibility of carrying the dead-meat through a country like Great Britain, the slaughter of the animals at the ports would not be objectionable, on the ground that it would reduce the food of the people?—I think not. I think the idea might be very well entertained of adopting such a system with the proper amount of notice. Of course, this change could not be made suddenly, because at this moment there is not more than one landing place in the country where all the arrangements are sufficiently extensive to enable the slaughter of the animals which are landed at the ports.

10021. And probably, also, an alteration of the trade would naturally require time before any substitute for it could be brought into working order?—Undoubtedly.

10022. I think you stated that you would prohibit meat from countries where cattle plague existed at the time; but some witnesses, especially Mr. Read, have expressed a strong opinion that that was hardly necessary; are you still of the same opinion?—I should certainly do it whenever cattle plague travelled to the coast, because, although I quite see the force of Professor Müller's remark, that the owners are paid the full value of the animals, I am also aware of the fact that that did not prevent the owners of the cattle which were sent on board the "Castor" from sending the live animals here; and it is so much more easy to slaughter diseased animals and send them off, there is so much less chance of detection, that I should be apprehensive that some persons would feel inclined to do that rather than incur the annoyance and publicity which would be involved in giving notice of the disease.

10023. Notwithstanding that, their giving notice of the disease would be no pecuniary loss to them?—Notwithstanding that.

10024. Therefore, you would still be of opinion that wherever cattle plague existed in the country there the prohibition would have to extend, not only to cattle but to meat?—For the time being I should certainly totally prohibit all animal products. The loss would be very inconsiderable, because the only country which we should have to deal with would be Germany or Belgium, probably Germany; and their regulations are of such a character that disease would be stamped out in a very short time.

10025. There is a proposal on their part to give us greater telegraphic communication, and there is the fact that they have taken notice, by the dismissal of their inspector, of the want of quickness which he displayed with regard to the shipping of the cattle in the "Castor"?—No doubt great advantage would arise from the improvements which they suggest, but in any case we should hardly get communication in time to enable us to stop a cargo. It has been stated publicly that a telegram was received relating to the leaving of the "Castor" in sufficient time to have enabled the Privy Council to have stopped the landing. I believe the Committee is informed already that this was not the case. The telegram did not arrive here until two hours after the animals were landed, and Mr. Read's statement that if the inspector at Deptford had been sufficiently energetic we might have informed

Chairman—continued.

informed the German government of the existence of cattle plague before they knew it was spoken, I apprehend, without sufficient information; because the Germans were aware of the presence of cattle plague in Hamburg on the Saturday, and the animals were not landed here until 10 o'clock on the Monday morning.

10026. From the evidence of Professor Müller, the fault, I think, seemed to lie in the present regulation, which forces the inspector abroad to send his information to the central department for transmission here?—That is the case; but even if we had had a telegram here late on Saturday night, or even earlier on Saturday, we should have known nothing about the movements of the "Castor," because no government is aware of the movements of any particular ship. We should have known that cattle plague was in Hamburg, and we might, under those circumstances, have expected the landing of animals from that port.

10027. At all events, earlier telegraphic information would put you in this position, would it not; that you would be able to inspect at once on arrival every vessel, without the chance, as in this case, of her going up the river to other places before she was properly disinfected?—We could have done that, certainly; but I would call the attention of the Committee to the fact that that is exactly what was done in 1872 on board the "Joseph Soames"; the animals were not allowed to land, they were slaughtered on board, and the vessel was disinfected before she was allowed to leave, and notwithstanding those precautions cattle plague got from the vessel into the Hull market somehow or other; so that even by that system we failed to obtain absolute security.

10028. And that is your answer to the suggestion that Germany offers greater facilities which ought to be accepted by this country as guaranteeing us against disease?—It is, I believe, that the only guarantee that we can fairly accept is the guarantee which we give ourselves by the total prohibition of cattle from German ports.

10029. You stated, I think, in evidence (and it has since been questioned) that a trade in offal had been established from Vienna to this country?—I was informed that offal was sent from Vienna to this country, and I understand from the evidence of one gentleman from Germany, that this is really the case to some extent; that intestines in some state of preservation were sent. When the information was given me I did not feel particularly interested in it, and I did not make any special inquiries; but I believe I stated to the Committee that I was not aware of it of my own knowledge. I may state that I am informed that some of the parts of the animal which are classed amongst offal, sweetbreads for example, are a very important article of trade during the London season between London and Belgium; I am told by persons who import them, that they occasionally have to pay as much as half a guinea a pair for them. They are sent from Ostend for the purpose of being used in London.

10030. Of course, at that price they would not be brought over unless they found a market in this country?—Evidently they must do so.

10031. That confirms what has been stated by Mr. Robinson and Mr. Rudkin, and by other witnesses, that the carriage of offal is not attended with the difficulty that has been suggested by some witnesses?—I do not see why it should be I do not understand why a bullock's heart or head, properly dressed, should not be kept as well as any other part of the animal's body.

10032. Then you agree with Mr. Rudkin in thinking that, if they were properly treated, all these things might be carried through England in the same way as the dead meat could be carried?—There can be no doubt of the fact that, under a proper system of regulations, they might be carried to any reasonable distance.

10033. And that, practically, as they state, a certain amount of trade in those articles is going on at present as between the Deptford Market and the towns in the interior?—I believe there is no doubt of it.

10034. It has been stated that the prohibition of live stock would have a very direct and serious effect on the price of meat, and we have had very conflicting evidence upon that point; evidence on the one hand, showing that the price of meat has not been affected by the prohibition which has taken place during the last few months; and evidence, on the other hand, that if you prohibited meat of this particular kind, which is wanted by a particular class of people, you would of necessity send up the price; with which of those views do you agree?—I should conclude that the total prohibition of the importation of live animals would necessarily send the price of meat up very considerably, and I do not apprehend that we should get anything like an equivalent from the Continent in the form of meat; because whilst prices remain as they are, normally high in Paris and in Berlin, it seems far more reasonable that a man should keep 20 oxen, and sell them in the Paris market at a high price, than that he should keep 30 or 40 more than he could sell at that high price in Paris, in order to slaughter half of them, and send them over here at a low price. The idea of meat ever coming down again to 5 *d.* or 6 *d.* per lb., as a general price, seems to me to be purely fanciful.

10035. That is as applied to continental cattle?—I believe the observation was made in reference to the effect of total prohibition of the import of live animals, that the result of this would be that in a short time meat in this country would be 5 *d.* or 6 *d.* per lb. If such a thing should ever happen, I imagine that it would arise from the fact of the prosperity of the country very materially decreasing, and from the purchasing power of the people being lessened; and certainly, if such a decrease of price takes place, the price of land and of feeding stuffs, and in short the cost of production of meat altogether must be very considerably less than it is now. I cannot conceive that farmers will produce meat for the purpose of selling it at 5 *d.* per lb. when there are other fields for their industry.

10036. You mean that prices generally have gone up so much that you do not think that they could at a profit return to the prices which used to be remunerative?—Clearly not under the present circumstances. The argument that I have always heard in favour of feeding is that the price of meat is high; but when the price of meat becomes low then meat no longer pays, and the argument is that you should produce corn. The price seems to be the stimulus to the producer.

10037. And that price affects the foreigner too, I suppose, at the present moment?—Undoubtedly; and

Professor *Brown.*

6 July 1877.

Chairman—continued.

and if the meat which he could send were of a plain character, as I know it would be, and would certainly command less in the market than the American meat, it would naturally follow that the American meat would drive it out of the market.

10038. Those remarks are with regard to the question of total prohibition?—They are.

10039. They do not apply to slaughter at the port?—No; I think that under those circumstances the foreign producer would aim at sending us the very best animals he could send over for the purpose of keeping up the price here, as they would be sent alive and in such condition that they could be slaughtered by the men who purchased them and took them to their depôts, at times convenient to themselves; presuming that the carcases could be kept (as I have no doubt they could be kept, at a place like Thames Haven, for example, where there is plenty of space) in proper cooling stores until they were wanted.

10040. You think that with proper arrangement at the ports at which cattle could be landed, and at which they would have to be slaughtered, and with the knowledge that the trade was a steady trade, in consequence of being obligatory, instead of being, as I may call it, dependent upon accident as at present, the foreign cattle would come to this country?—I believe so; but I say that only upon the understanding that the act should be the Act of the Legislature; I do not believe that a mere Order of Council would be sufficient to produce the effect.

10041. You think that a radical change of that sort ought to be under a legislative enactment?—Decidedly; so that it should be clearly understood that no amount of deputations and memorials to the Privy Council would be of the least use.

10042. Have you any information that you could lay before this Committee with regard to a point which has been raised as to the difference in commission that is said to be charged as between the foreign animal and the English animal?—I am told by the salesmen themselves and by the importers that there is practically no difference of the kind, that the allegation that there is is not true. I have no means of ascertaining the fact, but unless I am told deliberate falsehoods by men who are looked upon as being very respectable the commission is substantially the same. I believe that there is a slight difference of charges for tying up, and trifling things of that kind; practically I am told that the commission on a bullock in the Metropolitan Market amounts to something between 4 *s.* 6 *d.* and 5 *s.*, and that the nationality of the animal is not taken into account. I do not think that the matter materially affects the question, because if the statement was made for the purpose of proving to the Committee that the foreign importers are rather interested than otherwise in keeping up their own trade, I do not think it was necessary; I think it may be fairly assumed that they are.

10043. I understand you to say that although you have heard this, you are not able to assert it positively?—No; I am not able to assert it positively.

10044. I suppose that we could hardly look for perfect security, even under regulations such as you have suggested?—Considering the enormous facilities that there are now for the movement of animals in all directions, and the constant interchange of communication in all possible ways, I do not think we can under any system obtain absolute security.

Chairman—continued.

10045. What you recommend then is to attempt to obtain the nearest approach to that security by proper regulations?—By proper regulations in this country, and, to take the extreme view, by prohibiting cattle entirely from German ports, excepting Schleswig and Holstein, and allowing other animals to be landed at our own ports from all parts of Europe for the purpose of slaughter. I should not be disposed at all to interfere with the trade with the Channel Islands, nor, under the present circumstances, with the trade with America.

10046. You would treat the Channel Islands as a part of the United Kingdom, dealing with them as you would deal with Scotland and Ireland?—I should; that is to say, I should treat the Channel Islands as an unscheduled country, as we treat them now, with a sufficiently long detention of the animals to permit of their being inspected, and of its being ascertained that they were free from disease. I should treat the American and Canadian animals in precisely the same way, until in either case I found an instance of disease; and I may say that we have not yet, from either of these countries, found a single instance of contagious disease; but on the first appearance of it I should certainly deal with them as I should deal with the others.

10047. The Act which you suggest should be passed making it imperative would have to contain, I presume, an elastic clause, enabling you, should you detect disease in the American and Canadian cattle, to bring them also within its scope?—Certainly; it should do as it now does, that is, give the Privy Council power to prohibit importation, except under certain conditions.

10048. You think that the Channel Islands should be treated as part of the United Kingdom? I should still detain animals from the Channel Islands at the landing place; I should do it for the comfort of the animals themselves as well as for the convenience of inspection.

10049. In consequence of the passage?—Yes.

10050. With regard to the cessation of the returns for foot-and-mouth disease, I think it has been stated in evidence before this Committee that they ceased in 1873, when the disease had begun to decline; can you give the Committee any reason for that apparent want of curiosity?—It was complained that a great deal of expense was involved in getting those returns, and it certainly involved very considerable cost in the Veterinary Department in treating them and arranging them for publication, and there did not appear to be any corresponding advantage; but I can say most positively that they were not discontinued because the Privy Council was afraid to publish them any longer, for they were not discontinued during the time of the greatest prevalence of the disease; it was only after it began to decline that it was thought that they might be abandoned.

10051. You represent that it was not in consequence of any shirking of responsibility or fear on the part of the department that they ceased?—Certainly not. I do not see in what way the department's responsibilities could have been materially

Chairman—continued.

materially increased by refusing to take the returns any longer.

10052. With regard to a suggestion which was made by Mr. Read, although he praised very much the work that had been done by the travelling inspectors appointed under the recent order, yet he stated that he thought they ought to be veterinary inspectors instead of what he described, I think, as "general officers"; have you any remark to make upon that?—I do not think, judging from what I have seen in my journeys about the country, that the work which the travelling inspectors are called upon to do could possibly be better done than it is by any gentlemen, whatever their professional knowledge might be; and I think that if the scheme which I suggested be adopted, which would give us control over a large number of veterinary inspectors in the whole country, we should do far better by communicating with those veterinary inspectors than by sending travelling veterinarians from the Central Department.

10053. In fact, you would strengthen the number of inspectors rather than alter the character of the inspection?—Yes.

10054. It was stated also, I think, by Mr. Read, that whilst the Veterinary Department reported in 1875 that there was no foot-and-mouth disease in Belgium and Holland, we were actually directly importing animals in considerable numbers in those countries so affected; can you account for that at all?—I have no doubt that the information was obtained from our report. I have stated in my report this year that whilst we had no reports from pleuro-pneumonia from Germany for a certain period, animals with that disease were detected by our inspectors; and Professor Müller stated that that was likely to be the case, as they do not send us reports regularly, either of pleuro-pneumonia or of foot-and-mouth disease.

10055. Is there any other point in the evidence which has been given before the Committee which you wish to be examined upon?—I do not recollect any other point.

Mr. *W. E. Forster.*

10056. You stated, did you not, that you think that the ordering of all foreign animals to be slaughtered at the port of landing would be a check upon foot-and-mouth disease?—I believe it would, as nearly as possible, protect us from any chance of its re-introduction; but I should only suggest that system in connection with the stringent measures which I propose to adopt for stamping it out in this country.

10057. I am afraid I must ask you again to state the exact measures which you would propose to be combined with the slaughter of all the animals at the port of landing?—Supposing that the disease only existed in a certain number of districts, I should at once stop all movement of cattle in those districts except by license; I should also prevent the holding of fairs and markets except by license, which, of course, would only be given under special circumstances; and I should entirely prohibit the movement of any animals from a farm on which the disease existed.

10058. And unless there were those restrictions with regard to the home animals and to the

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

Irish animals, you would not think it at all advisable to order the slaughter of animals upon arrival, as far as foot-and-mouth disease is concerned?—No, certainly not.

10059. At the present moment, as we well know, all the animals that come in contact in a foreign ship with animals affected with foot-and-mouth disease are ordered to be slaughtered, whereas home animals under similar circumstances are not?—They are not.

10060. Would it not be a very considerable check upon foot-and-mouth disease, if the same plan were adopted, with regard to the slaughter of home animals, as is adopted with regard to foreign animals; I will take this as an illustration: would it not be a very great check upon the disease, if an Irish cargo were treated in the same way as a German cargo is, and if, any of the animals landing at Bristol being found to have foot-and-mouth disease, all the other animals were ordered to be slaughtered?—There is no doubt that that system would entirely stop the trade in store animals between England and Ireland. It would have the effect of preventing the introduction of the disease from Ireland, but it would only do it at the expense of the trade in stores.

10061. Supposing that it were applied only to fat stock, would it not have a strong effect?—No doubt it would.

10062. Taking the fat animals that arrive at the Islington Market, would it not have a great effect upon foot-and-mouth disease, if, upon a drove coming in with one or two amongst them affected, the rest were ordered to be slaughtered?—I should certainly insist upon that as part of the preventive measures.

10063. Would you not consider that that ought to be combined with any increase of strictness with regard to the import of foreign animals?—Undoubtedly, I should pay more attention to the Metropolitan Market than to any other part of the country.

10064. It was suggested by Mr. Rudkin, a witness of much experience, who appeared on behalf of the Corporation of London, that it would have a very good effect as regards the check of the disease to continue the cordon around London; do you concur in that opinion?—I quite believe that; I always held that view; but the inconvenience, of course, is very considerable, and if it were made a permanent institution we should be obliged to admit of certain relaxations.

10065. Will you explain to the Committee why that would be necessary?—At the present time the movement of animals from any one part of a circle outside the metropolis to the opposite side of the same circle is almost impossible; in some cases it is quite impossible, and in all cases it is exceedingly difficult; so that we should be obliged to make arrangements for movement through by railway, and I presume that we should also be obliged to allow an owner of milch cows to take them away under certain restrictions. There are favourite animals shut up in the metropolis now that the owners would be very sorry to have slaughtered.

10066. Do you find that there is much complaint in consequence of the cordon having lasted so long as it has?—We are already beginning to have applications made to us to remove

Professor *Brown*

6 July 1877.

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

the restrictions. Up to the present time it has been borne quite well, because it has been understood to be merely a temporary measure.

10067. I have been asking you hitherto with regard to foot-and-mouth disease; but as regards pleuro-pneumonia what other regulations would you combine with the order for the slaughter of all foreign animals?—I should deal with the districts in the same manner as I should with those places where foot-and-mouth disease exists; I should also shut up the premises and farms where the outbreak occurred; I should in all cases, of course, slaughter the diseased animals, and as far as possible I should arrange for the slaughter of all the fat stock which had been exposed to the infection. With animals which were not fit for the butcher I should prefer trying experimentally the value of inoculation; and for that purpose it would be necessary to compensate the owner for any animals that died in consequence of the operation, as if they were slaughtered, on account of pleuro-pneumonia.

10068. I suppose that you would not anticipate so much practical difficulty in carrying out those stringent pleuro-pneumonia restrictions as you would anticipate in carrying out the foot-and-mouth disease restrictions?—The chief difficulties would arise in the dairy districts, because I should be compelled to prevent the introduction of fresh stock probably for three or four months after the disease had apparently ceased.

10069. It has been stated in evidence, and, I think, by some gentleman appearing on behalf of the agricultural interest, that the restriction of movement and long isolation with regard to pleuro-pneumonia would not be of much practical convenience; what is your view as to that?—I believe it would totally ruin a large number of our dairymen. I know their system is to slaughter an animal and to get another one in the course of a day or two; and in that way they keep up their supply and keep up the disease.

10070. You were in the service of the Veterinary Department during the great outbreak of cattle plague in 1865, were you not?—I was.

10071. It was part of your business, was it not, to go throughout the country and see that the stricter rules that were in force when the plague had got a greater head were carried out?—It was.

10072. You found, I suppose, very great fear of the cattle plague throughout the country?—Generally; but in some districts there appeared to be no apprehension.

10073. Where you found that cattle plague really existed, and where there was all the danger from it, and the sense of danger from it in consequence of its prevalence, did you or did you not find any difficulty in carrying out the strict regulations?—In some places we found the greatest difficulty in carrying out the regulations; I have been told by owners of stock that they would rather have the cattle plague than have so much bother about it.

10074. I suppose it is from the remembrance of that opposition that you would anticipate great practical difficulty in carrying out equally strong regulations for such a disease as foot-and-mouth disease?—It is to a great extent on account of that experience.

10075. Mr. Read in his evidence stated that he would allow the continuance of the import of

Mr. *W. E. Forster*—continued.

store cattle from the Continent, especially from Holland, but under quarantine; have you had any experience with regard to quarantine?—The only experience that we have had has been on two occasions, one, I believe, at Thames Haven, and the other at Harwich; and that was on account of foot-and-mouth disease appearing in cargoes. The animals were in calf, cows in both cases. In the first instance, at Harwich, we found that it was necessary to detain them for something like six weeks before they could be set free; the owner never tried the experiment again, and he said that the cost and annoyance together were such that he would rather have them killed.

10076. That was a case in which there was quarantine on account of disease being discovered; but what would be the length of quarantine for all store animals that would be proposed to be combined with the order for the slaughter of foreign animals?—For foot-and-mouth disease ten days would be quite sufficient.

10077. How far do you think that such quarantine as that would affect the trade?—I do not think that, as a rule, people would take advantage of it, because they would find, as a matter of certainty, that a cargo would be landed with foot-and-mouth disease, and then the animals must be kept for a month or two probably or be slaughtered; and that would put a stop to the system.

10078. You think that such a quarantine would stop the trade?—I believe it would.

10079. I suppose to let in the store animals whilst you killed the fat animals, would take away the use of the restrictions with regard to fat animals?—Certainly; it would entirely negative the benefits of the system.

10080. With all your experience of the practical difficulties of carrying out any of the measures, and at the same time of the necessity of doing everything that you can reasonably do to prevent disease, would you, or would you not, so far as foot-and-mouth disease is concerned, advise any alteration of the present restrictions with regard to foreign animals?—Not unless it is seriously determined to stamp disease out of the country; unless it is admitted that the restrictions must be carried out at all risks, and in spite of any remonstrance, I certainly should not make any alteration in the present system.

10081. And you are still of opinion that it is very doubtful indeed whether those restrictions could be carried out?—That is my conviction, drawn from the experience which I have already had in the matter, although I am reminded that I have no right to interpret the feelings of the farmers.

10082. With regard to pleuro-pneumonia, you would give practically the same answer?—I should.

10083. Are you still of opinion, taking pleuro-pneumonia first, that no animal ever becomes affected with that disease without having been subjected to infection?—I think that all the evidence which we have points clearly to the conclusion that infection is the origin of the disease.

10084. And you make the same remark about foot-and-mouth disease?—Yes, certainly.

10085. Which

Mr. *Torr.*

10085. Which of those two diseases do you consider the more fatal to the herds of England?—Undoubtedly pleuro-pneumonia is much the more fatal.

10086. Which is the more prevalent?—Foot-and-mouth disease.

10087. Do you think that to deal with one of those diseases would be almost as difficult as to deal with both of them?—Quite.

10088. Then you would deal with the two together?—Certainly; because the same regulations would apply largely to both diseases.

10089. Do you think it would occupy an equally long time to stamp out the one as it would to stamp out the other?—No; I believe that we should get rid of foot-and-mouth disease sooner than we should get rid of pleuro-pneumonia, because the period of incubation is so short, and the infection consequently would not remain so long on the premises.

10090. You think it would be an easier matter to get rid of foot-and-mouth disease than it would be to get rid of pleuro-pneumonia?—Certainly.

10091. Have you formed any idea of the length of time that would be necessary to get rid of foot-and-mouth disease?—Very much would depend upon the way in which the system of restrictions was received by the persons concerned. If, as I expect they would, they threw all sorts of difficulties in the way, we should be years doing what might be done in a corresponding number of months if we were generally assisted.

10092. You think it is possible that, in the course of a certain number of months, foot-and-mouth disease might be got rid of, if the suggested restrictions were carefully and universally carried out?—I have no doubt that if we could do exactly what we wished, and nobody put any obstacle in the way, in 12 months we might be perfectly free.

10093. What time do you think it would take to stamp out pleuro-pneumonia under the same conditions?—Judging from the experience of Holland, it seems to me that it must take some years before we could pronounce ourselves free from that disease under any system.

Mr. *Elliot.*

10094. Do you agree with Mr. Clare Read, that no inspection at the port of embarkation could be relied upon?—I do not exactly understand the force of the observation. If Mr. Read meant that the foreign inspectors could not detect disease abroad, I do not agree with him at all, because I know that they do detect it; but as to the ultimate effect of inspection he is perfectly right, because they do not pretend to do more than stop the diseased animals, and they may just as well, as I have always said, send them over at once; in fact, we prefer that they should.

10095. It comes to this: that so long as foreign animals are imported we shall never be free from disease in this country?—We shall never be free from disease in this country so long as it exists abroad, that is to say, we shall never be free from the landing of diseased animals. Our ports will never be free from animals infected with the same diseases which they have at the ports abroad.

Mr. *Elliot*—continued.

10096. You said that the farmers would not submit to the severe restrictions which you suggest; have you had any complaints during the last outbreak from farmers pure and simple, not from salesman; have farmers not borne the restrictions with great patience?—I cannot say that they have. Some farmers have complained bitterly that they could not occupy their grazing land, and that they could not move their sheep from one meadow to another because they happened to be on one side of the metropolitan boundary.

10097. But I am talking of the local restrictions throughout the country, and of the Privy Council restrictions as well?—We have had representations from chambers of agriculture and societies certainly against the application of restrictive measures in some parts of their districts. I believe that the Lincolnshire Chamber of Agriculture strongly protested against the Council Order which stopped fairs and markets over the whole of Lincolnshire. That was in consequence of the outbreak that occurred near Great Grimsby.

10098. Did you say that 3½ per cent. only of the whole of the cattle of this country die of disease?—Our calculation was about 1½ per cent. I said I should be astonished if we lost as much as 3 per cent., or double that estimate.

10099. Can you give an estimate of the number of cattle that came into the country from abroad that are slaughtered by reason of the disease?—I have not the figures with me.

10100. If those cattle were not slaughtered we should have a very much larger percentage, should we not?—I think that the percentage would be something less than one per cent. of animals slaughtered for foot-and-mouth disease. The number of animals slaughtered for foot-and-mouth disease has been calculated, and I believe it is something less than one per cent. Animals that are slaughtered on account of the existence of disease of course are beyond those, because if 1,000 sheep come to Brown's Wharf and one sheep has foot-and-mouth disease, the 1,000 sheep are sent to Deptford and slaughtered.

10101. In talking of the restrictions that you would apply, supposing that the whole country were put under restrictions, would you stop all movement in the district or out of the district?—I should stop movement totally in the districts themselves until I ascertained what the state of things was.

10102. And then you would isolate the animals that were diseased?—Having found out all the centres I should surround them effectually, so that no animals could be moved from any of those farms where the disease exists.

Mr. *King Harman.*

10103. The complaint of the Lincolnshire Chamber of Agriculture, I suppose, referred to the size of the county and the fact that the outbreak having taken place in the extreme north the area was too large?—Yes, I believe they complained that the restrictions were more severe than the circumstances warranted.

10104. Do you say that they complained that they were more severe, or that they were more extensive than was necessary?—I believe that the actual terms which they used related to the

Professor *Brown.*

6 July 1877.

Mr. *King Harman*—continued.

closing of fairs and markets in all parts of the county when disease only existed in one part of it.

10105. With regard to the cattle from the Channel Islands do you think there would be any possibility of foreign cattle being smuggled into Southampton as Channel Islands cattle?—Not the slightest. The vessels only trade with the Channel Islands, and I know no foreign cattle which in any degree resemble the Channel Islands cattle.

10106. I thought the Brittany cattle resembled them?—They are quite distinct; the inspector would know them at once.

10107. You say that one difficulty with regard to the cordon around London is from owners wishing to remove favourite animals, but if those favourite animals were allowed to be removed now under proper restrictions, could not the cordon be easily removed?—Yes, but the difficulty under those conditions would be that everybody that wanted to move a cow would have a favourite cow to move.

10108. But those favourite cows are those which one may say have been caught in a trap in London when the cordon was put round the district; if those were allowed to escape now, and it should be perfectly clearly understood that for the future no animals would be allowed to go out owners would not put their favourite cattle in?—No, but it would be considered a great hardship by anyone in the country if he could not bring his Alderneys up when he came to town for the season; he would have to buy fresh stock, and leave his own animals for his servants.

10109. That is an individual case of hardship which would only occur in a few instances?—That is so.

10110. And in fact in cases where people could generally very well afford it?—No doubt.

Mr. *Murphy.*

10111. You stated, I think, that you had inspected the process of landing cattle at Bristol the other day?—I was there on Wednesday and Thursday this week.

10112. Do you know what ports in Ireland the cattle came from particularly?—They came from Cork and Waterford.

10113. You suggested that at the port of landing, say at Bristol, if proper regulations were put in force for the purpose of feeding and watering the animals before they came inland in this country, it would be a very great advantage both to the owner of the cattle and to the cattle themselves?—I have no doubt that it would.

10114. Do you think that it would be advisable in those places where the cattle should go to after being landed at Bristol, to set apart separate spaces for each port in Ireland where they came from, so as to be able to distinguish what ports they come from, whether from Cork, or from Waterford, or from Wexford, or from elsewhere, with a view, if any of them were diseased, of being able to have a special inquiry made at the port of embarkation with regard to them?—I think under that system it would be absolutely necessary that every cargo should be separated, in common justice to the owners of

Mr. *Murphy*—continued.

other cargoes, otherwise an outbreak of disease would infect the lot.

10115. Supposing that the cargoes came from Cork, or from Waterford, do you think that all the cargoes coming from those ports should be put into a particular division?—My own feeling is that all the cargoes should be kept separate for the sake of the owner; but what you suggest is already done; we always know from what part of the country the disease is brought, and returns are regularly brought to the Veterinary Department in Ireland, mentioning the places from which the diseased animals are brought.

10116. The object merely being that you may inquire what port they come from, and get a report from the veterinary surgeon, whose duty it is to examine at the place of embarkation?—That, as a matter of fact, is done now.

10117. Are you of opinion that if proper arrangements were made at the port of embarkation, yards being provided with plenty of water and food, and separate pens for the cattle, and a system of examining yards to facilitate the examination by the veterinary surgeon, and if those places of embarkation were close to the waterside, with proper disinfecting arrangements, that would tend to give a greater security of no cattle being sent from Ireland, except those that were really sound?—It would, to a considerable extent; but I should look to it as being advantageous rather for the comfort of the animals than for their freedom from contagious disease. I think the only plan that Ireland could adopt to keep her stock perfectly healthy is totally to prohibit importation, which would be a very small thing for Ireland to do, and then to apply the necessary regulations to get rid of pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease; and we might then be quite certain of having healthy stock, without having any restrictions at all.

10118. The question which I asked you was, of course, grounded upon the assumption that precisely the same internal regulations, with regard to the restriction of foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia, exist in Ireland as existed in England; I assume *à priori* that is so; but are you aware that no importation of foreign cattle is allowed into Ireland now under the Privy Council regulations?—Yes; but they get stock from England, and with that stock they get pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease, and then send it back again with interest. The real cause of contamination in Ireland is the introduction of English stock, and of English calves particularly.

10119. When you speak of foreign importation, are you aware that no foreign importation is allowed at the present moment?—At this moment, I believe, no importation is allowed at all, even from England, unless the Order has been revoked; there was an order passed totally prohibiting importation.

10120. Are you aware that the importation at any time of foreign stock into Ireland has been very small?—Very small. I have seen a few Spanish cattle landed at Dublin, but very rarely.

10121. In the year 1874, I believe, the last, and then only about 150 animals were imported?—The import is very small, and, therefore, Ireland would lose nothing by prohibiting from the Continent. The only small sacrifice would be chiefly

Mr. *Murphy*—continued.

chiefly in prohibiting calves from this country. Of course store stock, and pedigree stock, might be taken in under very obvious restrictions.

10122. You spoke of inoculation with regard to pleuro-pneumonia; have you ever heard whether that system was tried in the south of Ireland, about 10 years ago?—I believe it was.

10123. Did you ever hear of Professor Olden?—I know a veterinary surgeon of that name at Cork.

10124. Are you aware that, some 10 years ago, Professor Olden experimented upon pleuro-pneumonia, and that he suggested the system of inoculation, and that it has been very successful?—I do not remember his experiments, but there have been numerous experiments on the subject ever since Dr. Willems discovered what he considered to be the preventive, in 1852; but the evidence which we have gained from our experiments in this country is very conflicting; it is quite certain that inoculation is not an absolute preventive, because I have seen animals die after successful inoculation, and it remains to be ascertained, and could be easily ascertained, whether it gives such a reasonable amount of security as to make it worth while to treat a diseased herd under this system, as they are now doing in Holland.

10125. I am told that unless inoculation is practised at a certain incipient stage of the disease, it is very likely not to prove of the same advantage as if it had been performed at a more advanced stage of the disease; do you concur in that opinion?—In all my experiments upon diseased animals, even in the incipient stage of the disease, it has increased the mischief. The only chance of success, I believe, is where you deal with animals perfectly healthy which have been exposed to the disease, but which have shown no symptoms of it in themselves.

10126. Where it has been practised in that way before the animals have got it, as in the human system before the smallpox has been caught, has the result been analogous to that of vaccination in the human system, that is to say, as a preventive of smallpox?—No; I have not been able to arrive at that conclusion at all. In some cases the disease has ceased after inoculation, when the diseased animals have been slaughtered and the rest of the herd inoculated; but in more cases the same thing has happened when the diseased animals have been slaughtered and the others have not been inoculated; so that the evidence at the present time is exceedingly unsatisfactory, and without testing the operation over a large extent of country, I do not think that we shall arrive at any satisfactory conclusion. We know of hundreds of cases where inoculation has apparently succeeded.

10127. You say you would apply the same system, as to restricting the movement of cattle for foot-and-mouth disease, to Ireland as you would apply to England?—Certainly I should deal with Ireland just as I should deal with any other part of the kingdom.

10128. And you have stated that the accident of having a streak of sea between England and Ireland enables such an examination to be made at the port of debarkation as could not be well made in cattle moving from one point in England to another?—Quite so, and it was of that the Irish Government complained that we took advantage of the circumstance to stop the animals in transit; and they were right.

Mr. *Murphy*—continued.

10129. You include the cattle coming from Scotland; do you think that they should undergo the same examination if they come by sea?—Yes, and also by land.

10130. How could you manage it by land?—If I had command of the inspectors over the country I should have the trucks regularly inspected at all the stopping places; they commonly run into sidings and I should take care that there was somebody to look round, and the inspection of Scotch cattle could be made quite as satisfactorily as it is now of Irish cattle.

10131. You would recommend the same system to be applied, if it could be applied?—If it could be applied, certainly.

Mr. *French*.

10132. In your visit to Bristol during the last two days, you say that you saw a large number of cattle landed there, and although you did not inspect the animals they appeared to be healthy?—Yet, judging from the inspection that one can make of animals huddled together on a landing place.

10133. Have you had reports from the inspectors at Bristol lately, and if so, do they show that foot-and-mouth disease is prevalent in Ireland or otherwise?—It is not prevalent in Ireland, but a few cases are landed; for example, the diseased animals which have been landed from Irish ports during the first half of this year, that is to say the animals affected with foot-and-mouth disease are:—At Holyhead seven sheep and 18 swine; at Bristol 12 sheep and 185 swine; at Liverpool one sheep and six swine; at New Milford four swine; and at Silloth 20 swine, making a total of 20 sheep and 233 swine, which is a very small number considering the amount of importation.

Mr. *Arthur Peel*.

10134. Were there any diseased cattle landed?—No, no cattle at all; we have had no case of diseased Irish cattle for a length of time.

Mr. *French*.

10135. How do you account for the fact that the disease is chiefly amongst the swine, when you say that as a rule those boats bring over a very mixed cargo of cattle, sheep and swine?—But the disease would not be communicated to the other animals during the voyage in such a way as to be perceptible.

10136. You think that the boats are so well cleansed afterwards that it is not spread to the next cargo?—It is not spread if they are all cleansed as well as they are at Bristol.

10137. With regard to the dairy sheds in large towns, do you think it would be advantageous gradually to do away with them?—In reference to the prevention of contagious diseases it undoubtedly would, but I do not apprehend that it is possible, because the attempt to expel the slaughter-houses from London failed, although it was done by Act of Parliament, for just before it came into operation the pressure put upon the Legislature was such that another Act was passed

Professor *Brown.*

6 July 1877.

Mr. *French*—continued.

passed to revoke the provisions of the previous one.

10138. Did you hear the evidence which was given with regard to the Aylesbury Dairy Company?—I did.

10139. Do you not think that milk could be brought into London in a similar way by other dairy companies?—I have no doubt that it is as easy to bring milk a distance as it is to bring meat; but the amount of opposition to such a measure as doing away with the cowsheds in towns would be such that there would be very little probability of carrying it.

10140. You said, I think, that if you found amongst a herd of fat cattle coming from Ireland one suffering from foot-and-mouth disease you would have the whole herd slaughtered?—I do not think I said so; it was merely in answer to a question as to whether dealing with Ireland as a foreign country would have the effect of arresting the entrance of disease, and I said that as a matter of course it would. If the whole cargo was slaughtered as it is when it comes from abroad, we should cut off so many centres, but I did not contemplate doing that; I should not advise anything being done in reference to Ireland that I would not advise in reference to the rest of the kingdom. I should deal with the whole of the kingdom on exactly the same basis.

Mr. *Chamberlain.*

10141. That is to say, that even in the event of these very strict regulations being put in force, you would not propose to treat Ireland as a foreign country?—Certainly not.

10142. With regard to the death-rate of cattle, I think you said that 3 per cent. was your estimate?—No, the estimate which we arrived at very roughly was 1½ per cent., but I said I should be very much surprised to hear, on good authority, that the amount was double that, and I totally disbelieve that it amounts to 5 per cent.

10143. Supposing that 3 per cent. die from all causes, would not that give an average length of life of 33⅓ years to every head of cattle?—I am afraid I should be obliged to employ our statistical clerk to settle that question.

10144. Unless I am mistaken it appears on the face of it, that if only 3 per cent. die each year it will be 33⅓ years before they all die?—But then you leave out all the slaughtering.

10145. Is the average life of a healthy cow 33⅓ years?—Certainly not.

10146. Does not that show that your death-rate must be incorrect?—I confess that I do not follow the argument in the least, because on that principle, if you take 5 per cent., the average of a cow's life must be considerably more than it really is.

10147. Five per cent. would give an average life of 20 years, supposing that the animal was not previously killed for the purpose of the food supply?—It would not be 10 years. I should think that the average life of an ox in this country is not five years, or not more than that.

10148. Then if the average life of an ox is only five years, 20 per cent. of all the oxen must die every year?—I must be content to admit everything that you say upon that subject, because I am not in a position to explain it. I know, as a

Mr. *Chamberlain*—continued.

matter of fact, that it is not the case; but I believe that so far as figures are concerned, any one who is clever at working them can prove anything. I know certainly that 20 per cent. do not die, and that the average life is not 20 years.

10149. You do not place much trust in your own figures?—I do not place much trust in anybody's figures on this subject, I may say.

10150. Supposing that you were not allowed to carry out these very extreme regulations you propose, I think that the work which is now done by the local authority should be left to the central department?—Yes, I think that unless the central department has some district power of interfering and directing, it will be impossible to prevent the movement of infected animals in the way that they are moved at present, and I think that the case which I referred to of the outbreak of pleuro-pneumonia in the town of Bedford proves that it is so.

10151. Have you had any cause hitherto to complain either of negligence or of ignorance on the part of the local authorities in carrying out the regulations?—I have been in the habit of saying that the subject is not one which comes within their scope; that they have not the technical knowledge necessary, and that they have not the requisite machinery.

10152. That would not apply to the local authorities of large towns, would it?—I think so; I think that the local authorities of large towns are less inclined to make the regulations than the local authorities of counties are.

10153. I know most about my own town; have you had any cause to complain of the way in which the Act has been carried out in Birmingham?—I believe that Birmingham is particularly strict in its regulations, and the inspectors are remarkably active and capable men; but certainly the same remarks cannot be made of every town in this country.

10154. In the last case of cattle plague did you have any difficulty with the local authorities?—Yes, we found it impossible in some cases to get the regulations carried out with sufficient energy and promptness, and certain recommendations which we thought it necessary to make were simply disregarded.

10155. What regulations?—For example in London, the same butchers were employed to slaughter animals that were herded with those affected with cattle plague and those affected with pleuro-pneumonia; the same men who took the carcases of the so-called healthy animals from a shed where cattle plague existed would to-morrow be employed in dealing with carcases of animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia; the same men would go into the two sheds.

10156. Without being disinfected?—We had no means of ascertaining whether they were disinfected.

10157. You do not know that they were not disinfected after killing the unhealthy animals?—No.

10158. Surely, it is rather a hasty conclusion, is it not?—I say that I do not know that they were not, but I am morally certain that they were not; I cannot say that I know, because I did not see them; but my information leads me to state, without hesitation, that they were not disinfected.

10159. Is it on such grounds as that that you would

Mr. *Chamberlain*—continued.

would take away this duty from the local authorities throughout the country?—Certainly. If I met with a single case where local authorities were employing men to go from sheds where cattle plague existed to sheds where it did not exist, I should not ask anything further. I should take away their power at once.

10160. Are there not instances of neglect at least as great on the part of the central authority?—I am not aware of any. The central authority has had so little to do beyond advising and reporting that I do not exactly see how any case of negligence could be charged against it; it has certainly been very liberal of its advice and suggestions.

10161. Taking the case of Irish cattle coming into Bristol, in which it appears that the central department send down inspectors with no power to interfere, and expressly prohibiting them from interfering, although the Act gives them power to interfere when they see diseased cattle, would you consider that a due exercise of its power by the central authority?—The Act only gives them power to act when the local authority declines to act.

10162. I understood the Chairman to say that they had the same power as the local authority?—Yes, there is a section in the Act which provides that every inspector of the Privy Council has over the whole of Great Britain the power of a local inspector in his district. But that was meant for remarkable cases of emergency; it does not mean that the Government should appoint inspectors everywhere to do the local inspectors' work, otherwise you adopt the principle of centralisation at once.

10163. And yet it seems absurd that your inspectors should be on the spot and able to prevent the mischief, and yet that they should be expressly prohibited from interfering?—It is simply impossible that one of our inspectors could seize half a dozen pigs, or three or four oxen, and take them to a convenient place, and there separate them for the necessary period until they had recovered. We have no power of acquiring property in those places, and we should meet with no assistance from the persons around, because they would not like to have infected animals brought near them, so that the inspector is practically powerless, and, therefore, he is told not to go through the form of professing to have powers which he does not actually possess; but the information which he gave to the local authority has enabled that local authority to take action when it has been so disposed.

10164. How long were you in putting your powers into full force in the country?—The Order was passed on April 12th, and it came into operation on April the 16th.

10165. When did the rinderpest break out?—It was detected in Limehouse on the 31st of January.

10166. Then the action of the Central Department was not very prompt in that case?—The action of the Central Department was not contemplated at all, because the whole action is left to the local authority, and it was only in accordance with the strong pressure put upon the Central Department that they agreed at last to step in and do the local authorities' work.

10167. Have you no positive cases of negligence to charge against the local authority?—I do not remember any special instances except one may say generally that they do not take advantage of the powers which are conferred upon them. They have power, for example, to prohibit and regulate the movement of animals that have been herded with those suffering from an infectious disease, but they do not do it.

Mr. *Chamberlain*—continued.

Professor *Brown*.

6 July 1877.

10168. You say that you do not take advantage of all the powers which are placed in your hands, I suppose for good and sufficient reason; do you dispute that they may have had good and sufficient reason too?—Yes, I do dispute it, because I think we take advantage of our powers so far that we give the local authorities more regulations than they have carried into effect.

10169. That may be because in the exercise of their discretion they do not think your regulations wise?—That is the very point. As a sanitary department we do not think the local authorities ought to have any opinion in the matter, but that it is simply their business to do the work that is set out for them and to attend to all the suggestions that are made, and they certainly do not do that. I do not attribute any blame to them on that account; I merely say that it is not within their province to deal with questions relating to contagious diseases.

10170. In the case of a local authority employing its own experienced officers, as in the case of Birmingham, I presume that it would have ample means of forming a correct opinion on the subject?—Yes; but I must repeat that Birmingham stands with a few other towns in an exceptional position. The local officers are generally policemen, and it is very rarely that veterinary surgeons are called in to assist the policemen.

10171. In cases in which the local authority do not carry out your regulations, have you any means of interfering?—Only by remonstrating and suggesting.

10172. You have no power?—I presume that we have power by an Order in Council, but that involves the principle of centralisation.

10173. But if they do not carry out your regulations, why do you not force them to do it, having this power in reserve?—That is what I propose to do.

10174. You propose to do so in the case of those who are not guilty; I say why do you not do it in the case of those who are guilty?—There are so many that are guilty that I do not think it would be worth while to leave out those who are not guilty, and so to establish an exception.

10175. You would punish all the big towns, such as Manchester, Liverpool, Birmingham and Bristol, because some of the smaller places do not come up to your idea?—I do not think that either Liverpool or Bristol are doing perfectly well.

10176. But you have said that you have no evidence of positive negligence on their part?—Yes, I have the evidence of years; I have the accumulated statements which have been made to me, and which have been repeated over and over again. I got yesterday the answer which I was prepared to receive from the local authority when I went to make the statement which I had to make; I asked if they were prepared to furnish a convenient place for the reception of these animals, and for the reception of those that were herded with them; and the answer which I got was what I have always got, viz.,

Professor *Brown.*

6 July 1877.

Mr. *Chamberlain*—continued.

viz., that they were not prepared to take such steps, and that they did not intend to find lairs for the reception of Irish animals for the encouragement of the Irish trade.

10177. They are not bound by law to do it, are they?—I will not pretend to interpret the clause strictly, but I believe they have power to seize an animal that is moved in contravention of the 57th Section, and to take it to some convenient place for the purpose of preventing the extension of the disease; and they have power to make regulations to prevent the further movement of all the animals which have been herded with diseased animals; and as it is necessary that these regulations should be made if they mean to stop the disease, it seems to me that the act of not making them is an act of negligence.

10178. What is the excuse in that case for their not doing this which you think necessary?—I do not think that they have made any excuse; they merely say that they do not intend to do it. I have been told that they have no means of doing it, that they have no premises, and that they do not intend to erect them.

10179. Have they funds which they can apply for such a purpose?—I do not know.

10180. You yourself think that it is doubtful whether they have the legal authority to do it?—The Act distinctly states that they may do it.

10181. That they may provide premises?—Yes, there is a section of the Act which gives them power to purchase land for any purpose connected with the carrying into effect of the provisions of the Act, and they have power to levy rates. I think they have full powers under the Act if they like to exercise them. I am not complaining that they do not exercise them, but I merely state the fact that they do not.

10182. Do you not think that everything that you desire could be obtained without taking the execution of the Act from the local authority, but merely giving the central department greater power with respect to the making of regulations?—If, in addition, the central department had power to call for the enforcing of the regulations, so that it should not be left to the discretion of the local authority as to whether the regulations should be enforced or not, it might not be necessary to actually supersede them; but it certainly would be necessary to have the power to direct that the regulations should be carried out.

10183. If you had power to see that the Act was carried out, that would be sufficient for you?—Presuming that that power went to the extent of enabling us to telegraph to the local authority, to state that disease had broken out in such a place, and to insist that the regulations directed by the Privy Council should be applied to that place without delay, some such power as that would meet the difficulty.

10184. Without superseding the local authority?—Yes, I should not call that superseding them; it would still leave them the power of control to a certain extent; but I should not leave them the power to decide whether certain regulations were to be carried out or not.

10185. Would you leave them the absolute power of appointing their own servants?—I see no objection to that, because we have by the Act power to dismiss if we do not approve of the appointment.

10186. Have you had correspondence with some of the local authorities with respect to the cleansing of cattle trucks?—Yes, but it is some-time back.

10187. Do you recollect that it was urged upon the department that the railway companies should be required to cleanse the cattle trucks at the station before they were allowed to be removed?—Yes.

10188. And the department, I think, were in favour of that?—We found from the representations made by a deputation from the principal companies, which came to the Lord President upon the subject, that it was impracticable; that the detention of the trucks at the station where the animals were unladen would involve so much obstruction that they represented that they would not be able to carry on the traffic of their lines, though it would be possible at certain stations.

10189. Has it been stated to you that it was the practice of all the companies to do this up to a certain period, until they discovered that they were not compelled to do it by the Act?—It was the practice at certain stations, but not at all.

10190. Would it not be very desirable that it should be done wherever practicable?—Yes, I think it would.

10191. You have not the power to require it at present, have you?—I am not quite clear about that. I believe we have very large powers to make regulations with regard to animals in transit, for cleansing and for disinfection, and I presume that we have power to say that a truck should not be moved from a station until it had been cleansed and disinfected.

10192. But you have always declined to make such regulations?—Simply because the railway companies assured us that it could not be done without totally interrupting the traffic of the line; and they went so far as to say that they would not be responsible for consequences, if we insisted upon detaining trucks in the middle of the line where an extensive traffic would be going on.

10193. I understand you to say that you think it desirable and practicable that that cleansing and disinfection of trucks should be done at the larger stations?—Yes, but an Order in Council could hardly deal with a few stations. If we left some stations out (and we must leave some hundreds out), it would naturally happen that the companies would go on exercising their own discretion, and doing it where it was most convenient to themselves, as they do now; but there would be always a large number of stations at which it could not be done.

10194. By far the larger proportion of the traffic is at some hundred of the largest stations, is it not?—It is.

10195. You could make the rule apply to all of those, could you not?—We could.

10196. Do you think that additional power should be given to the local authorities to control and license cowsheds in the same way as they now control and license slaughter-houses?—Undoubtedly.

10197. Do you think that power should be given to the local authority to enter premises where glanders and farcy are supposed to exist, as they can in the case of cattle plague?—There would be a difficulty about that, because glanders

is

Mr. *Chamberlain*—continued.

is not a disease which is so distinctive as cattle plague, and it would be met, I have no doubt, by a great deal of opposition. To give a man the right to go into any gentleman's stables to examine his horses is rather a strong measure, and it could only be done by Act of Parliament; but, so far as the sanitary question is concerned, there is no doubt that the inspectors should have that power.

Mr. *Pease*.

10198. I think I understood you to say, in answer to a question put by an honourable Member, that if Mr. Read's plan of quarantining milch cows was carried out, it would practically put an end to the trade?—I believe it would.

10199. Do you not think that it would be attended with very beneficial results to the existing dairies?—I should attain the result in a much more simple way by slaughtering all animals at the port of landing.

10200. That is to say, you would put an end to the importation of store beasts?—I should, because I see no way of dealing with them which is not so complicated as really to negative all the benefits gained by importing them.

10201. You think that the improved condition of the dairies would in any degree compensate for the want of supply of store beasts?—I have no doubt that we could get a sufficient supply of dairy cows from our own country, and we must be content with the cows which were fattened in the Netherlands and sent here for slaughter.

10202. Confining it to milch cows, do you not think that it would tend, in the first instance, to a very great increase in the price of milk, especially in such places as London and other large towns?—I should think not, considering the comparatively small number of Dutch cows that are introduced.

10203. You think that it would be more than compensated for by the increased health of the remaining cows?—Certainly; if it had an important effect in reducing pleuro-pneumonia, the good effects would be beyond all calculation.

10204. I think you stated that you would be prepared to give a considerable time for carrying out any change in the regulations, if it involved slaughtering all beasts at the port of debarkation?—Yes, I think that we should be bound to allow a considerable time.

10205. What length of time do you think would be required?—I think that it would vary in different parts of the kingdom. I should say that as a maximum we should allow 12 months, and I should take different periods during that time of three, six, and nine months.

10206. I presume you are acquainted with the position of the port of Newcastle?—Perfectly.

10207. There, I believe, they have no accommodation whatever for slaughtering?—At the present time they are, by way of completing the most perfect landing place that I know.

10208. Have they, at the present moment, slaughter-houses?—No, not to any extent, but there would be no difficulty in converting a large number of their present sheds into slaughter-houses. They have a site which is, without exception, superior to anything on the coast.

Mr. *Pease*—continued.

10209. It would involve a very large outlay, I presume, to slaughter the number of animals which they bring in, which is something like 1,000 a week?—I do not think that the expense would be a serious element, because the persons to whom the animals belong pay for the slaughter; and, in fact, it is a profitable business.

10210. Are you acquainted with the general character of the trade from Newcastle into the colliery districts, and up among the ironworks?—Yes.

10211. Do you not think that the slaughtering there would be attended with very great inconvenience to the supply of meat in those colliery districts?—Not if proper regulations were made for cooling the meat, and keeping it in good order. I believe that it might be sent quite as easily as live cattle are sent such an exceedingly short distance.

10212. You think that the trade would accommodate itself, if it had fair time, to the circumstances of the case?—I have no doubt that it would when it was once known to be a matter of absolute necessity.

10213. You do not think that the necessity of slaughtering at the port would add very materially to the cost of the meat to the inhabitants of that district?—I do not think it should, if the slaughtering were conducted in a proper manner.

10214. Does it not involve the small local butchers buying dead meat instead of slaughtering their own animals?—Yes, it does.

10215. You do not think that they would buy their beasts at the port and slaughter them there?—I think they would find it more convenient to buy carcases; in fact, they would be driven out of the market by the large butchers.

10216. They would deal through a middleman?—Generally.

10217. Does not that involve another profit?—Yes, to a certain extent; but I presume that the price would be regulated by the paying power of the consumer.

10218. Do you think that the improved health of the cattle in the country would at all bring down the price of meat proportionately?—I do not think it would bring down the price to any great extent.

10219. But would it bring it down to an extent equal to the amount by which it would be raised by the increased cost of slaughtering at the port?—Yes; I do not apprehend that the result of this system, when it is fairly established, would be an actual increase in cost. I should imagine that, on the whole, when we get a more healthy race of cattle, the price would be decreased to some extent, because the animals would be purchased more cheaply.

Colonel *Kingscote*.

10220. The honourable Member for Birmingham asked you if you knew any case of a local authority being negligent in carrying out the regulations; the late outbreak of rinderpest having taken place at Willesden, as it did on a Tuesday, and the Privy Council Office not having heard of it until the Saturday, although the local inspector was called in on the Wednesday, you would

Professor *Owen.*

6 July 1877.

Colonel *Kingscote*—continued.

would call that a case of negligence, would you not?—Certainly, it was a case of negligence on the part of the officer, although the local authorities of Middlesex are among the most active, and the instant that the clerk of the peace for the county heard of the disease, he came to the Privy Council Office with the inspector who brought the news; for some reason or other, he did not feel satisfied that it was cattle-plague, in fact, he distinctly told the owner that it was not; but under the system which I propose, such a thing as that cannot possibly occur, because on the mere report or suspicion of the disease, the premises would be taken possession of.

10221. Do you consider that if the Privy Council had not taken the matter into their own hands, the local authority of the metropolis would have been able to stamp out the cattle plague in the same time, since the Orders of the Privy Council came into force?—I do not think that they have shown the same power of dealing with it which was exhibited by the Central Department, because they had already had to deal with it for nearly three months before we commenced our operations, and it was still spreading outside the metropolis; and other outbreaks occurred subsequently in the metropolis.

10222. As regards steamboats bringing cattle, do you not think that a longer time should elapse between their discharging cargoes of live cattle and taking in fresh cargoes; as for instance, in the case of steamboats coming from Ireland to Bristol with cattle, and their taking cattle back from Bristol to Ireland?—I do not think that that is done as a rule; it must be in exceptional cases, for they generally take back ordinary cargoes as soon as they are disinfected.

10223. But I presume that you would consider that a bad practice, as being likely to engender infection on board the ship?—It is not a practice that one would recommend, although if the disinfection were perfectly conducted, it might be safe.

10224. I suppose you have no doubt that foot-and-mouth disease was intoduced into America?—The evidence is not absolutely satisfactory. I have not seen any statements which convince me, beyond all doubt, that the disease ever was introduced there.

10225. I thought it spread into several States?—I think it existed only to a very slight extent, and it was stamped out very quickly indeed.

10226. Has it died out now?—So far as we know there is no case of foot-and-mouth disease in the States.

10227. I suppose you would consider it a great gain to this country if foot-and-mouth disease could be stamped out?—Undoubtedly it would be an enormous gain; the gain chiefly arising from the immense value of our improved breeds, which suffer more than others from attacks of that disease.

10228. It would also be a gain to the consumer in the price of meat, would it not?—Yes. I believe that if those diseases ceased to exist, animals would be purchased at a lower rate, and therefore you could produce the meat at a lower cost.

10229. With regard to a question which was put to you by the honourable Member for Liverpool, who asked you whether, supposing that you were in a position to dictate the stoppage of all

Colonel *Kingscote*—continued.

importation of live stock, and also of all movement of cattle, and to stop fairs and markets in this country where foot-and-mouth disease broke out, establishing a zone or circle round every such place; you were of opinion that it would not take above 12 months to get rid of the disease; do you think such a result might be attained by the adoption of those measures?—I think that we might get rid of foot-and-mouth disease in that time.

Mr. *Arthur Peel.*

10230. When you advocate the slaughter at the ports, I understand you to recommend that hypothetically, on the assumption that we wish to extinguish foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia?—Entirely.

10231. I ask you that question because there is an expression of yours on page 21 of this Report of 1876, in which you suggest that "the introduction of diseased and infected animals from abroad can be prevented by slaughter of imported cattle at the port of landing, but (you go on to say) the danger would be reduced to a minimum if all exporting countries would consent to apply the system of compulsory slaughter of diseased cattle and the isolation of infected herds;" and then you say that you might place in the schedule all exporting countries which declined to adopt that rule. According to that view, you would freely admit cattle from all countries which consented to adopt those stringent regulations, and you would schedule those countries which refused to do it. Would you do that now with your present views?—The slaughter of animals at the port of landing is the extremest measure of precaution that I should adopt as an alternative to total prohibition, which I think could not be tolerated; but I should be prepared, as I stated to the Committee in my previous examination, to allow the landing of stock from countries where no disease exists, and where the regulations are such as to make it probable that no disease would be introduced from those countries, on the understanding that the cattle should be dealt with when they arrived here as I should be dealing with the cattle of the country. For example, those cattle which were landed for slaughter I should immediately transmit to a slaugthering depôt; those which were landed purely for stock purposes, I should keep under observation in the premises of the persons to whom they were consigned.

10232. If by this plan you would reduce the danger to a minimum, we should scarcely need any more precautions, should we?—By reducing the danger to a minimum, you only diminish the risk; you do not obtain what would be, in common parlance, absolute security. If you want to prevent the introduction of these diseases absolutely, I see no escape from the conclusion that you must slaughter at the port of landing.

10233. Assuming that you would slaughter at the port of landing, I suppose that at every port where cattle came in now, you would establish these slaughtering depôts?—I should limit the number to those ports which had the space necessary for the erection of the proper premises.

10234. Of course, the fact that the trade comes to those ports now, shows that convenience has dictated lines of trade; and you would not interfere,

Mr. *Arthur Peel*—continued.

fere, I suppose, with what commercial enterprise has already pointed at as the proper lines of commerce?—Except in those ports where they declined to make the proper arrangements for slaughter, or where from the local conditions they could not make them. There are some ports which would have to be struck out still.

10235. Is there great variety in the quality of the cattle which come now to this country?—Yes, great variety.

10236. Do you anticipate that that variety would continue if there was slaughter at the ports?—I think that it is probable, when they found out that the best animals made the best carcases and fetched the best prices, they would take care to send a better class than they now send.

10237. You think, therefore, that a higher class of animals would come at a higher price?—I think so. I think they would manufacture cattle for the English market as they manufacture wine for the English market.

10238. And, in addition to the natural high price of the animal, there would be an additional price caused by the requirement of slaughter at the port?—Decidedly.

10239. So that the consumer would have to pay considerably more for his beasts than he would under the other system?—For some beasts, certainly.

10240. For all beasts, if all were slaughtered at the port?—He would probably not get the second and third rate quality of meat to the same extent that he gets it now.

10241. Do you not think that that would be a serious loss to the poor consumer?—I apprehend that there is always a certain quantity of parts of the beast which are sold at a low price, and the poor consumer would get the coarser portions of a better bullock instead of the better joints of a worse bullock; and probably he would be a gainer by the exchange.

10242. With regard to the importation into Ireland, I understand you to say that there is very little importation of foreign beasts into Ireland?—At the present time there is none, and there has never been any importation of any consequence.

10243. Is there anything in the fact of the existence of foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia in Ireland, as compared with the small importation of foreign cattle, which would lead you to suppose that those diseases are generated in Ireland?—No. Considering that we are always sending animals over there, and that outbreaks in Ireland have been traced frequently to the introduction of English stock, I have no doubt that we are the cause of the infection in Ireland.

10244. Is there a large export of cattle from this country to Ireland?—Not a large one, but a sufficiently constant one to keep up the supply of disease.

Mr. *Jacob Bright.*

10245. I judge from the answer you gave just now, that the inferior cattle would probably be kept out by slaughter at the port of landing?—I think it is very probable that they would be.

10246. It would seem as though there must be some risk in that case, that the people who can only afford to pay for the inferior meat would not get quite so much as they got formerly?—I think there would be always enough inferior meat sent to give a reasonable share to those who could not afford to pay for anything better.

Mr. *Jacob Bright*—continued.

10247. Still, to those who consume the inferior meat it would be rather a serious matter, would it not, if they felt that we were adopting some new plan which kept back a quantity of inferior meat?—Yes, but taking the supply from abroad, which we should slaughter here, and the supply which we should get from America, I imagine that the prices would not be likely to rise above those which are at present obtained.

10248. When you support the view that cattle should be slaughtered at the port of entry, as I understand you, it is always on condition that we have restrictions with regard to our home cattle?—Certainly, because I fail to see that we should get any benefit worth the cost unless we do.

10249. Unless we have, in fact, restrictions and restrictions that may be continued as long as necessary?—Certainly.

10250. You admit that to slaughter at the port of entry, if the people in the interior of the country are to get the meat in good condition, greater preparations must be taken than those which now exist?—Undoubtedly they must.

10251. Will you describe to the Committee what those preparations ought to be at Newcastle or Hull, or anywhere, where cattle would have to be killed for large populations in the interior?—At a place like Newcastle or Deptford they would be required to construct the necessary slaughter-house accommodation for the number of animals which they expect to receive. Of course that would be a mere matter of calculation. They would also require to have for the reception of the carcases chambers which were artificially cooled, so that the heat of the meat would be gradually reduced.

10252. How would you have those chambers cooled?—The methods which are now in use in the American depôts, I have no doubt, might be applied here; but even the simple expedient of keeping a current of air passing over a wet surface would have a great effect, and that is never done in this country.

10253. In point of fact you would require the meat to be cooled and prepared probably as the American meat is now prepared?—Not to the same extent; perhaps 24 hours would be necessary to cool it, so that it would then last for some days, even in the hottest weather.

10254. By whom is this preparation to be made?—I presume by the persons who now receive the animals which are landed alive, the corporation in most cases.

10255. Would not it be done by a private enterprise?—Generally I should think it would be done by the corporation of the town where the animals are landed, and sometimes by the dock authorities. There is no doubt that the transit of cattle is a very profitable affair, and so long as they can be brought here alive no doubt there will be plenty of people ready to carry them.

10256. Do you propose to exclude store cattle altogether?—Except stores which are required for particular purposes; and they could be landed, as they are now, at Southampton, or if necessary, at any other port where similar arrangements might be made.

10257. And we should still run the risk of diseases

Professor *Brown.*

6 July 1877.

Mr. *Jacob Bright*—continued.

diseases being introduced by store cattle?—I have never known an instance of the introduction of disease along with store cattle which were selected for that particular purpose and quarantined at Southampton.

10258. You would treat the Channel Islands and America as unscheduled countries?—I would.

10259. You would not do the same with Spain, would you?—No, because we get foot-and-mouth disease from Spain. On several occasions there has been foot-and-mouth disease amongst Spanish cattle, and we have been informed of outbreaks of pleuro-pneumonia on the west coast of Spain.

10260. There is no other European country that is as free from disease as the Channel Islands, is there?—No country that we know of at all.

10261. You gave some evidence with reference to the effect in some of the counties of England of the recent restrictions, and you named the county of Bedford; I understood you to say that there were some counties where disease had greatly diminished if it had not entirely disappeared?—Yes.

10262. Are there not parts of England where there were no such restrictions, but where the disease has much disappeared?—I am not prepared to answer that question, because I have not had time, in consequence of going to Bristol, to compare these returns with the arrangements made by the local authorities; but I should think it is quite possible that it is the case, because foot-and-mouth disease frequently disappears from a county or from a district when, from any cause, the traffic through that district has been temporarily stopped, and not uncommonly from the circumstance that all the diseased and infected animals are rapidly sent out of it to markets and distributed to other districts.

10263. Still I am speaking of counties where restrictions have not existed?—I am not aware of any cases where disease has died out naturally, unless in the way that I have described.

Chairman.

10264. You were speaking just now of the dairies in London; have you any knowledge of the number of cows kept in the London dairies?—I have a report of the number of dairies, but it is only in a few cases that we have been able to get a statement of the number of cows. I know that as compared with 1865 and 1866 the number of dairies has considerably diminished, and therefore I conclude that the number of cows has also diminished.

10265. Is that in consequence of the dairy trade being more established in the country?—I have no doubt that the supply of country milk has lessened the number of town dairies.

10266. But you have no actual knowledge of the number of cows?—No, we have not been able to obtain it.

10267. You stated, in answer to the right honourable gentleman the Member for Bradford, that from your experience of Holland you thought that we should take years to stamp out pleuro-pneumonia?—Yes.

10268. The delay in stamping out pleuro-pneumonia in Holland arises, does it not, from the fact that they have not until very recently

Chairman—continued.

attempted it?—Yes; so far back as 1870 they stopped the importation of cattle.

10269. But they took no steps beyond the inoculation of the animals for getting rid of the disease among their own herds, even after they had prohibited the re-introduction of disease from abroad?—In 1872 slaughter was made compulsory.

10270. At the discretion, I understand, of the mayor of the locality?—No, I think the diseased animal was slaughtered compulsorily, and the rest of the herd also, unless they were inoculated.

10271. The impression left on my mind, from Mr. May's evidence, was that it was only within the last year that they had practically attempted by these more stringent regulations to stamp out the home diseases, and that as the result of those regulations they had, as he stated, stamped them out as nearly as possible in the district to which they had been applied, that is Friesland?—I think that remark was made in reference to the action which they have taken in Friesland, of slaughtering the whole herd; but the other regulation to which I have referred, I have taken during the various years from the official papers which we have in the office from the consul in Holland.

10272. As to your recommendation with regard to these restrictions, do I correctly understand you to say that these restrictions should apply universally all over the country, and that if an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease or pleuro-pneumonia occurred in Devonshire, the restrictions would apply equally to Northumberland; or would you merely apply them to such districts as were reported to be subject to the disease?—In the present state of affairs, where disease is scattered about, I should merely deal with the district in which disease exists; but when foot-and-mouth disease prevails, as it did in 1872, I should certainly be compelled to deal with the whole country.

10273. What you mean then really is, that in recommending these regulations to be applied to the home districts, if the slaughter at the port is to take place it would not necessarily mean that these regulations should be a hard-and-fast line applying equally to districts where there was no pleuro-pneumonia and no foot-and-mouth disease and to districts where the disease existed?—Certainly not.

10274. Therefore the annoyance to the home trade would only exist in those districts in which your returns showed you that these diseases were rife?—Only in those districts; but there are now some 34 counties in which pleuro-pneumonia exists.

10275. That number of 34, I suppose, is reduced by the number that you have now fresh evidence about, in which foot-and-mouth disease has disappeared?—Yes.

10276. With regard to the question of inspection and the powers under the Act, general powers are given, under the 57th section, to the inspector of the local authority, to inform against any person who exposes in a market or fair, or other public place, or on any railway or highway, any animal affected with an infectious or contagious disease, and to seize the animal for the purpose of slaughter or removal; that is so, is it not?—Yes.

10277. Therefore

Chairman—continued.

10277. Therefore, of course, anybody has the power under that section, of prosecuting?—Yes.

10278. Then, under the 75th section, the regulations are given to the local authorities, and under the 76th section, "A person for the time being appointed by the Privy Council an inspector, for the purposes of this Act, shall have for and throughout Great Britain all such powers, authorities, and privileges as an inspector of a local authority has within, or in relation to, his district, and a direction of the Privy Council shall, in the case of an inspector appointed by them, be deemed equivalent to a direction of a local authority in the case of an inspector appointed by them." That clause gives absolute power to the Privy Council inspectors to deal as the local inspectors can with cattle infected travelling upon a highway?—Yes; but it was felt that that section was so distinctly directed to certain emergencies, where special interference on the part of the Central Department would be necessary, that the inspectors have always been instructed not to interfere with the action of the

Chairman—continued.

local authority, unless they receive particular directions from the office.

10279. You have practically limited the powers which might have been exercised under the Act, because you had not the full means of carrying them out?—Certainly, it was the case that we had no means of carrying out the powers, and, therefore, it would have been absurd to tell the inspectors to exercise them.

10280. And if these powers are useful, and ought to be carried out, it points to an amendment of the Act?—Yes; and it points also to the principle of centralisation, that is to say, giving the Central Department not only the powers, but the means to enforce those powers.

Mr. *King Harman.*

10281. You said that 34 counties were affected with pleuro-pneumonia; how many counties are affected with foot-and-mouth disease?—There were, in May last, 24 counties in England, including the metropolis, subject to foot-and-mouth disease; none in Wales, and none in Scotland; we have no return from Ireland.

Thursday, 19th July 1877.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Anderson.
Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. Chaplin.
Mr. James Corry.
Mr. Dease.
Mr. Wilbraham Egerton.
Mr. Elliot.
Mr. John Holms.
Colonel Kingscote.
Sir Rainald Knightley.
Mr. Murphy.
Mr. Pease.
Mr. Arthur Peel.
Sir Henry Selwin Ibbetson.
Mr. Torr.

SIR HENRY SELWIN IBBETSON, IN THE CHAIR.

Professor GEORGE THOMAS BROWN, re-called and further Examined.

Professor *Brown.*

19 July 1877.

Chairman.

10282. IN your last evidence before this Committee, you said, in answer to a question that I put to you, that you thought you might state to the Committee that the cattle plague which broke out in the beginning of this year had been finally stamped out, and that from a date which I think you fixed at the 17th of May there had been no further outbreak in the metropolis, and that, looking at the time in which those diseases are supposed to develope themselves that gave you sufficient guarantee, in your opinion, for the correctness of that statement; since you gave that evidence, I believe, another outbreak has taken place in the metropolis?—The statement which I made then I based on the fact, as we then believed it to be, that no case of cattle plague had occurred since the 17th of May, and it was generally considered that an interval of nearly two months was sufficient to justify the belief that the disease had ceased to exist. There was a clear apprehension that an outbreak might occur in one of the premises where disease had previously existed and had not been detected; and in consequence of that apprehension, the Metropolitan Cattle Plague Order, which prohibits the removal of cattle, sheep, and goats out of the metropolitan boundary, was continued in operation; so that if an outbreak should occur, there might be no risk of animals which had been herded with diseased ones being sent into the country. Another outbreak of cattle plague, in point of fact, has occurred, and the disease was detected on the 14th July.

10283. Where did the outbreak occur?—The outbreak occurred in Norfolk-street, Bethnal-green.

10284. Had there been any previous outbreak in that district?—The last previous outbreak occurred on the 17th May, in White's-row; and an outbreak occurred, at some little distance, in Suffolk-street, on the 17th of March.

10285. Were both those outbreaks in the Bethnal-green district, on the 17th May and on the 24th March?—The one on the 24th March was in the Whitechapel district, but the distance is something under half-a-mile in either case; and by the dots which I have put on the map

Chairman—continued.

it will be evident to you that the two last outbreaks are almost equi-distant from the point where the carcases of the animals are destroyed, at Barber's the horse-slaughterer's.

10286. The circle with the black cross in it which is between the two red centres, is the place where the carcases are sent for the purpose of destruction?—It is (*the Witness pointed out to the Committee on a Map the sites of the recent outbreaks*).

10287. These other red spots, I presume, are the sites of the other outbreaks that have occurred during the last four months?—They are.

10288. And in all of them the disease had disappeared before the 17th May?—Certainly, in all of them.

10289. With regard to that spot which is equidistant from the site of the present outbreak, and from the site of the outbreak of the 17th of May, I understood you to say that the bodies of the animals that had been slaughtered in the previous outbreak were buried there?—They were taken there to be boiled down; after being cut up into quarters, they are placed in a copper and submitted to the action of high pressure steam. I may say that this is the only possible method of dealing with the carcases in places like Bethnal Green and indeed in most parts of London, because we have no means of taking possession of lands, as they have in Germany, for the purpose of burial. The plan is undoubtedly objectionable, but it is the only one which can be adopted. I say that it is objectionable for one reason which occurs to me at this moment; Mr. Courtney, the travelling inspector, who has taken charge of the destruction of carcases, on one occasion at least, saw cats go from the vicinity of the outbreak of the 17th May into the knacker's yard; he saw them jump through the iron railings, and he presumed, reasonably enough, that they had gone there for the purpose of feeding on the carcases; and those same cats would of course after their meal go back to the premises to which they belonged, and habitually they would go into the cow-sheds, and they commonly lie very close to the animals which are kept there. On another occasion, when the chief inspector went to a slaughter-house

Chairman—continued.

house in the west of London to make a post-mortem examination of some parts which had been left for him, he found that the larger portion of them had been eaten by some animals during the night; and it is quite probable that those animals were cats that had got out. I mention this as a possible source of an outbreak, which would generally be looked upon as mysterious if there were no connecting link of this sort.

10290. With regard to the evidence which you are at present giving, you only refer to that to point to the danger of the system which is at present adopted of boiling down the carcases, but you do not wish to lead the Committee to suppose that the disease can have been disseminated in that way in the present instance?—Certainly not in this instance.

10291. Has any inquiry been made officially as to the present outbreak?—We have ascertained that the premises on which the last outbreak occurred were inspected on the 12th May, and at that time there were in them 11 animals, reported to be perfectly healthy.

10292. Was that ascertained by an inspection made by a person who went from your office, or was it simply hearsay?—It was merely information given by the wife of the owner. The inspectors had sometime previously to the 12th May been instructed not to insist upon entering premises, because we found that the owners of cattle were very strongly opposed indeed to visits of inspectors at all; several complaints on the subject were made to the Lords of the Council, and in one or two instances it was suggested that if an outbreak of cattle plague did occur after the inspector's visit, the owner would hold the Government responsible for the full amount of damage which might have been incurred. We had a large staff of men, and although we have taken every precaution, and anyone who met with cattle plague was distinctly instructed to confine himself to those premises, and not to visit other premises again until he had been perfectly disinfected, and had changed his clothes, still there was that objection; and under the circumstances we felt bound to instruct the men not to insist upon visiting, but to content themselves with a house to house inquiry.

10293. Then, practically, the inspection which has been exercised over those dairy sheds since the 17th of May has apparently been simply information derived from the people themselves in charge of the cattle, without the least investigation being made as to whether that statement was true or not?—Certainly, in the majority of cases it was so.

10294. Therefore there was absolutely no guarantee that disease was not in existence during the whole time in the shed, although the statement was made that the animals were perfectly free from it?—There was no stronger guarantee than the statement of the owner of the premises.

10295. That of course did not apply to the premises which had been infected; there you exercised an effective inspection, because your inspectors themselves ascertained the fact that no fresh outbreak had occurred there?—Certainly, in those cases; because, as it was presumed, that cattle plague had ceased, there was no apprehension that the inspectors visiting the animals had previously been in contact with diseased animals,

Chairman—continued.

so that the owners did not object to have their sheds visited after the fresh stock had been introduced.

10296. At the same time, I suppose the same objection might be raised in that case; the stock would be considered fresh stock; the inspector would come to the owner without the owner's knowing that he had not been in contact with diseased animals; and therefore if it is sound in principle that he should visit a place that has been infected it is sound in principle that he should visit all the others?—It is so in reality, but the same objection is not felt. I believe that in very few instances was there any attempt made to prevent the inspectors from seeing the animals, but even then they were distinctly told that if an objection was raised they were not to force an entrance.

10297. I understand that at present there is legal power of entry given to the Privy Council?—There is not, unless the inspector has reason to suspect disease; and he is called upon to give his reasons in writing if he is asked to do so.

10298. Before going to the present outbreak, I should like to ask whether, in your opinion, you having charge of the Privy Council Department dealing with these complaints think that at all a satisfactory inspection?—It certainly is not, in my opinion. So little satisfactory do I think it, that I advised the removal of all the extra inspectors as soon as there was reason to believe that the disease had ceased.

10299. In your opinion, does not an inspection which is valueless in its results, but upon which the public may rely for security against disease, give a false security to the public?—It does; and for that reason I do not intend to propose the appointment of any additional inspectors now, but to obtain the sort of information which those inspectors obtained for us by the aid of the police, who, in that particular, I believe, will act more efficiently than professional men.

10300. With regard to the type of this particular outbreak, have you ascertained thoroughly to your satisfaction that this is an outbreak of real cattle plague?—There is, I believe, no question at all about the matter. Our first information was obtained through the police. We have reason to believe that the owner did not intend to inform the Government of the fact that the disease existed amongst his animals, and the evidence which we have up to the present time been enabled to gain, leads us to suspect that the animals would all have been slaughtered on the night when the cattle plague was first detected. The owner certainly did not give notice, and he will, I apprehend, if it can legally be done, be prosecuted for not having given notice. At the same time, if it is clearly shown that he did not give information, it will be submitted to the Lords of the Council that no compensation whatever shall be given; and I may go further, and state to the Committee that that course will be recommended if unfortunately any further outbreak should take place; if the disease should be discovered before the owner gives notice, he will, if possible, be prosecuted, and compensation will be entirely withheld.

10301. You have stated that the information was given to you by the police on this occasion; are you aware how the police became acquainted with the outbreak?—It appears that on Friday, the 13th July, at about 6 o'clock in the evening,

Professor *Brown.*

19 July 877.

Chairman—continued.

some man who gave either a false name, or a false address, or both, called at the Bethnal Green police station, and stated that the milk-sellers in the neighbourhood had declined to sell any milk from the premises referred to in Norfolk-street, in consequence of the report that the cows there were very ill; and it was further stated that the owner intended to have some of the animals killed that night. A policeman was immediately sent to inform the local inspector, Mr. Shaw, who at once attended; and on arriving at the shed he found such evidence of cattle plague, that he immediately telegraphed to me, using these words: "Please come as soon as possible; I have some cows at 15, Norfolk-street, Bethnal Green, that are very suspicious of cattle plague." The chief inspector, Mr. Cope, went at once to see the animals, and found that the evidences of cattle plague were quite distinct. Further, it was noticed that in some of the cases, that peculiar type of symptoms which has not been recognised, excepting in occasional instances, during the recent outbreak, was remarkably well developed. It was observed by the local inspector, that we had got back to the old type of cattle plague. The chief inspector telegraphed to me at Liverpool, where I then was, to the same effect; but in order that there might be no question at all about the matter, I directed that Professor Simonds, Mr. Priestman, and the inspector of cattle at the Metropolitan Market should be asked to see the animals; and after making a careful inspection, including a post-morten examination of several of them, their unanimous conclusion was, that it was cattle plague of the most pronounced type.

10302. Of course, every precaution was taken with regard to dininfecting the people who were admitted under those circumstances?—Certainly; they, as scientific men, adopted the most complete method; in fact, Mr. Priestman assured me yesterday that he did not come away from his house again with a single article of clothing on which he had on at the time when he made the inspection, and that after undressing, he took the precaution to have a bath before putting on fresh clothes; so that I do not apprehend that there is the slightest danger of the disease being disseminated by those gentlemen who were engaged in this work.

10303. At the time that the first inspector viewed the animals, were any of them then dead, or were they slaughtered afterwards?—All the animals, 10 in number, were alive at the time of his inspection. One died the same night that they were seen by the chief inspector of the Veterinary Department; that animal was the one which was undoubtedly first attacked, and the one which probably introduced the disease.

10304. You have stated that 10 animals were affected; did I not correctly understand you to say that at the time of the previous inspection (the unsatisfactory inspection, as I call it), when the wife spoke as to the health of the animals, 11 was the number in the sheds?—There were 11 animals in the sheds on the 12th May. On the 12th June pleuro-pneumonia was detected on those premises, but at that time there were only eight animals; so that between the 12th May and the 12th June three animals had been disposed of.

10305. Pleuro-pneumonia having in the meantime developed itself in the shed?—That is so.

Chairman—continued.

Only one of those eight animals was attacked, and it was slaughtered in the usual way; the other seven appear to have remained healthy. Then, on the 22nd June, the cow which died on the day of the declaration of cattle plague was brought in by a man named Plummer, who is a drover, and also a jobber, and who has premises not very far from the scene of the outbreak. Then, on the 3rd July, two other animals were brought in by Mr. Payne, and my first impression was that the disease was most probably connected with the introduction of those two animals, but Mr. Payne (who is here) has been seen upon the subject; and he states that the animals came from his own premises at Romford, and that he has a large number there which are now perfectly healthy.

10306. Have you been able to trace this previous introduction of another animal on the 22nd June?—We have; and we have also ascertained that that animal was known to be ill on the 10th July. It was certainly in the very last stage of the disease when it was seen by the chief inspector, and it died in a few hours afterwards.

10307. Therefore that animal which had been affected by this disease since the 22nd June had been standing with the other animals in the shed, as you imagine?—It had; and that would account for the extension of the disease to the whole of the animals in the shed.

10308. That time would be sufficient to develope the disease in the whole of the other animals, supposing that it was brought in by that one?—It would.

10309. You have traced the two last introductions of animals coming from Mr. Payne, of Romford, to this herd; can you state where the animal came from which Mr. Plummer, the jobber, brought in on the 22nd June?—We have not been able to trace that animal yet, because when one of the inspectors visited Mr. Plummer's premises yesterday he was not at home, and his wife stated that they had only one cow, and she refused to allow the chief inspector (who made this visit) to see it, as her husband was not at home; but she assured him that it was perfectly well. This will, of course, form a subject of further inquiry; but, up to the present, I have not been able to obtain any further information upon that point.

10310. Has the man Plummer himself a dairy-shed?—He has a shed in which he keeps animals that he has purchased, until he finds an opportunity of selling them to dairymen; and he is generally, I believe, employed as a drover by one of the cattle salesmen at the market.

10311. Has Plummer's shed been the subject of any inquiry during the last few months in the recent outbreak?—No; no inquiry has been made with reference to Plummer; his name has not in any way transpired until this event.

10312. Will you describe to the Committee the system which is at present adopted with reference to sending cattle into these dairy sheds; are they purchased from the salesman in the country direct, or are they sent in on approval?—The system which is adopted appears to be in some way mysterious. I have been informed repeatedly, certainly during the last 10 years, that dairymen have cows sent to their sheds by dealers, when they do not even know that they are coming; indeed, as a matter of fact, the dairymen themselves have told me repeatedly that

Chairman—continued.

that they may have two or three cows, or even a larger number, sent in without any warning that they are coming; and I have also been informed that they do not pay for them at the time that they are sent, but that they pay some sort of instalment of their value, or something in the way of hire, and that when the payments or instalments amount to the value of one or more cows, those cows are put to their credit, and for the rest they still go on paying. I may, however, tell the Committee that these statements are absolutely denied by the dealers who have most to do with the London dairies. Of course, individually, I cannot possibly be in a position to say which is the truth; but I am quite unable to understand why dairymen should make these statements unless there is some sort of foundation for them.

10313. Of course if there was any foundation for those statements, such a system would be most objectionable, from the fact that the animals would be constantly liable to be shifted from one dairy to another?—That is so; and I am perfectly certain that the dealers have some sort of control over the animals, because it happened quite recently that the inspector of the Metropolitan Board of Works was sent for in a great hurry to examine an animal which a drover was waiting to take away, and the owner assured him that he had not the slightest idea that anybody was coming for it. The gentleman under the Metropolitan Board of Works, who has charge of all the regulations relating to cattle plague, made that statement to me yesterday, and he complained of the great inconvenience which was caused in consequence of the liability which the inspector was under of being summoned at any moment to license the removal of a cow, the owner not being at the time aware that any such removal was contemplated. As a matter of fact, there is no question at all that that really did happpen. The actual system under which such things are possible I can only refer to from what I have heard.

10314. But if such a thing occurred, that clearly points to the fact that the owner, or supposed owner, had not the property in that cow? Certainly.

10315. All this points distinctly, then, to a confirmation of the evidence which we have already had, that the dairyman in London practically has the greatest possible facilities for evading any restrictions that are placed upon the movement of animals, and for not only receiving but spreading the disease broadcast through the town?—There is no doubt whatever that that is the case under the existing system; and unfortunately it seems that no amount of compensation is sufficient to tempt a large number of men to give notice of the existence of disease, in consequence of the great interruption to their business which is the necessary result. If a man has disease, which he believes to be cattle plague, or even knows to be cattle plague, he can easily get the animals out to a slaughter-house, which may be close at hand; he may clear out his sheds, and have them swept and washed and roughly disinfected; and there is nothing to prevent him from getting a fresh stock of animals in the following week. But if he gives notice of the disease, he knows perfectly well that his business will be interrupted for some weeks, and possibly for some months.

Chairman—continued.

10316. Therefore, in consequence of the fresh difficulties that have arisen in this case, the proper inspection and proper restriction upon the movement of their animals, to which the representative of the dairymen who gave evidence before this Committee stated that the dairy men were willing to submit, becomes absolutely necessary?—Undoubtedly it does; but I may say that the willingness of the dairymen to submit to any restrictions is an assumption which is contradicted by the whole history of the outbreaks of cattle plague in the metropolis from the year 1865.

10317. But we as a Committee have had before us the evidence of the representative chosen by those dairymen, who, acknowledging here the difficulties that there were in protecting the town against the spread of the disease, owing to this constant circulation of the cattle through the dairies, said that he, speaking for his association, was willing that proper inspection, and proper restriction as to movement, should be enforced?—I have no doubt that a certain number of the higher class of dairymen would be willing to submit to proper restrictions, and it is certainly exceedingly desirable that all the dairies in the metropolis should be under proper supervision. A large number of the places where cows are now kept are totally unfit for that, or indeed for any other purpose; and it is exceedingly desirable that something should be done for the purpose of bringing the whole of them under proper restrictions in regard to their general sanitary arrangements, even irrespectively of an outbreak of disease.

10318. And in the interests of the public the dangers that they are liable to from those men who may object to proper regulations are so great, that this Committee may, in your opinion, fairly infer that one of the principal amendments of the law that is now required is a proper inspection of places of this kind?—Undoubtedly.

10319. You have given us, in your previous evidence, the history of the former outbreak in the metropolis this year, and I think you gave us an account of the action that was taken on that discovery?—I did.

10320. Will you state what are the regulations now in force?—Immediately on the detection of the disease in Bethnal Green I received a telegram, informing me of the fact, even before it had been absolutely determined that the affection was cattle plague; and I, in answer, submitted that an Order should be at once passed absolutely to prohibit the movement of cows from any dairies within certain limits round that district; the Order which was passed prohibited the movement of cattle in the whole of the metropolis, and it was found that so much difficulty would be caused in giving licenses to and from the Metropolitan Market, and so much interference with the entrance of the cattle from the country, where we have no reason to believe that disease exists, that I submitted to the Lords of the Council the desirability of revoking that Order, and substituting another, which establishes what we have termed an "infected area," which I have placed upon this map, surrounded by a red line (*producing a map*).

10321. Then the restriction on the movement of cattle at the present time is limited to that infected area?—The Order provides that "for the purposes of this Order that part of the metropolis which is situate within the following boundaries

Professor *Brown.*

19 July 1877.

Chairman—continued.

boundaries shall be deemed to be the infected area." Those boundaries are marked on the map. Then the prohibitions are, "No cow or heifer shall be removed alive out of the infected area. No animal (that is to say, no cattle of any kind, or sheep, or pigs) shall be moved alive out of a cow-house or shed within the affected area. The movement of cows and heifers within the infected area is hereby prohibited, except as follows; and then follows the exceptions. This was done in order to allow the few fat cows which may be sent from the country to the Metropolitan Market, to be sent to Whitechapel, which we have included in the infected area, where there is a large number of slaughter-houses. There is no objection to letting them in, but we prevent their exit; and further, we restrict the action of this part of the Order to cows and heifers, because we have no desire to interfere with the passage of oxen which are sent for slaughter in any direction through this district; there is no object in preventing that.

10322. Do you mean that the transit of fat animals through the infected area is allowed?—There is nothing in the Order to prohibit it, because the animals would only be sent from the Metropolitan Market to Whitechapel for the purpose of slaughter.

10323. But I understood you to say, that besides that there was a permission of the transit through this area of oxen that were being driven not to the slaughter-houses but to other places?—There is nothing to prevent it.

10324. That is surely a possible mode of spreading the infection?—Hardly so, because those oxen would not be likely to come in contact with any diseased animals in the infected area, for the reason that the removal of them out of the sheds is absolutely prohibited. Neither a diseased nor a healthy cow or heifer which is now in a shed in the area can be taken out.

10325. And this does not in the least interfere with the cordon which is still in existence round the metropolis, across which cordon no animal can be driven?—It does not in any way interfere with it. We still protect the country by shutting up the whole of the metropolis, and we have further protected the counties on the south side of the Thames, by totally prohibiting the movement of cattle from any part of the north of the metropolis into any part of the south of the metropolis. Having revoked the Order which gave local authorities power to protect their own counties, we thought it only fair that as the counties north of Middlesex are protected by the metropolitan boundary, we should protect the counties which are partly in the metropolis south of the Thames by totally prohibiting movement across the bridges.

10326. Therefore, whilst you have made the boundary line of the metropolitan area the protection of the north, the River Thames is the protection for the southern counties?—That is so. These two Orders I hand in. (*The same was handed in.*)

10327. Have you at all altered the course of action which you propose to adopt in case of any further outbreaks?—The establishment of the infected area occurred to me as an advantageous substitute for the system which has hitherto been adopted of giving local authorities power to make regulations for their own protection, which regulations may seriously interfere with the traffic of cattle without any corresponding advantage; and I should propose in the possible event of any further outbreaks, to deal with any part of the country as we have dealt with the Bethnal Green district; that is to say, to make a certain boundary an "infected area," and to avoid the use of the term "infected place," excepting as applicable to the premises where disease exists.

10328. That is, I think, very much carrying out the idea that was sketched out to this Committee of dealing with the home trade for the purpose of stamping out the disease?—It is, to a considerable extent; I may add, that the advantage which arises from calling a place an "infected area" is, that we avoid all the difficulties which attach themselves to infected places. In an infected area, declared by Order in Council, it seems that we have absolute power to make almost any regulations we please with regard to the animals in that area.

10329. When was it first brought to your notice that the power existed of creating infected areas in opposition to the system which has been in use up to the present time?—The idea occured to me when we were engaged in drawing the Order yesterday afternoon. I had seen the advantages of having power to declare large areas infected, but practically great difficulty arose in consequence of the restrictions imposed by the Act; no person can take out a joint of meat of more than a certain weight, and fodder from perfectly healthy places cannot be moved without a license, and a variety of difficulties of this kind occur; and the term "infected area," suggested itself to me as a substitute; and at the same time, with the use of that term, the 76th Section seems to give us power to make any regulations that may be required.

10330. Would that power extend beyond the metropolitan area, to localities in the country?—I apprehend that it would extend to any part of the country where the Privy Council has power to legislate for cattle plague. At present that power is limited to the Metropolitan Police district.

10331. But that only applies to one disease, the cattle plague?—I believe it would apply to any contagious or infectious disease.

10332. It would therefore apply to outbreaks of pleuro-pneumonia or foot-and-mouth disease?—Speaking under possible correction from legal authorities, I should say that it would.

10333. Therefore, under the Act as it is at present, the Privy Council has power to deal in the way that was suggested by the agricultural witnesses with outbreaks of these contagious diseases in any part of the country?—I do not think I should be correct in saying that the Privy Council have this power in all parts of the country. I believe at present we can only deal with the Metropolitan Police district; we can deal with any diseases in that district, I apprehend.

10334. But that is because you have assumed the full control which one section of the Act gives you, the local authority having failed?—That is so.

10335. Does not that same section give you power to take the control on the failure of the local authority in rural districts also?—It gives us power to declare infected places in regard to cattle

Chairman—continued.

cattle plague, but that is a power which we cannot conveniently exercise.

10336 You have now, as I understand you, assuming that you have power over the metropolitan area, altered your system of dealing with it; and instead of dealing with it as infected places, you have dealt with it under this new Order in Council as an infected area?—That is so.

10337. Could you not in the same way deal with any part of the country where you thought the local authority had failed to carry out the proper restrictions?—I do not think we have any such power, except where we have assumed the function of a local authority, in the Metrolitan Police district, and then in regard merely to cattle plague.

10338. Does not Section 75 of the Act give the Privy Council full power to do this anywhere in Great Britain?—I am not quite certain that would give us that power; if it does, it seems to me to give us all the power which we require.

10339. That Section enacts that the Privy Council may from time to time make Orders for certain purposes, "and generally any Orders whatever which they think it expedient to make for the better execution of this Act, or for the purpose of in any manner preventing the introduction or spreading of contagious or infectious disease among animals in Great Britain, and may in such Order direct or authorise the slaughtering of animals that are affected with any contagious or infectious disease, or that have been in contact with animals so affected; and may in such Order direct or authorise the local authority to pay compensation for any animal so slaughtered; and may in any such Order impose penalties for offences against the same not exceeding the sum of 20 *l.* for any such offence, and so that in every such Order provision be made that a penalty less than the maximum may be ordered to be paid; and this section shall extend to horses and all ruminating animals not within the definition of animals in this Act." That section seems to give you power first of all to regulate and prohibit the building of markets and to regulate the disposal of dead animals, and the further power to make any orders in any area that you choose?—It does so apparently; but we are advised that that power can only come into operation when there are no specific provisions in the Act giving the local authorities special powers to deal with certain diseases.

10340. And that power you have exercised over the metropolitan area, because the local authority have failed?—We have, in regard only to cattle plague.

10341. What seems to be wanted is, that that power of the Privy Council, as sketched out in that clause, should extend to all these diseases, and that it should be applicable all over the country?—That is so; and for that reason it has constantly occurred to me that if the Act had stopped with the 75th section, we should have all the powers that we require; I think that a short Act, embodying what is stated in that section, would include nearly all that would be necessary.

10342. Going back to the question of this last outbreak, you have not been able, I think I understood you to say, to trace where the animal came from; have you made any inquiries as to whether the animal was an important animal?—There was no foreign animal in the shed at the time of the chief inspector's visit except two Dutch cows which had been in there a long time.

Chairman—continued.

10343. Was that at the time when his first visit was made, on the declaration of the disease?—On July the 14th, when the existence of cattle plague was first reported to the Veterinary Department.

10344. At that time there was no animal in the shed of foreign origin?—Only the two Dutch cows.

10345. And therefore if the disease came in the way that you suggest, it must have come from an English animal which had been infected previously in the other outbreak?—It is possible, of course, that during the interval between the 17th May and the 14th July other outbreaks may have occurred, and dairymen may have got rid of their stock in the way that I have suggested.

10346. In the way that you have suggested that this man probably would have done, from the fact that he did not give notice of the outbreak?—Yes. We have already met with one instance in that same district, where a shed has been entirely emptied in the interval. In this case the man had an outbreak of pleuro-pneumonia, and he therefore suggests that it was on this account that he got rid of his stock. I may, however, state that this is quite contrary to the course of proceeding generally. There is no instance that I have ever met with where a dairyman has got rid of the whole of his stock in consequence of an outbreak of pleuro-pneumonia?

10347. You are of opinion that that would point to the possibility of there having been another centre of cattle plague in that shed?—I think it is quite possible.

10348. So that we are no means safe that the evidence that you gave us the other day is correct, that cattle plague is even now stamped out by the slaughter of those animals?—No, it would be premature to suggest that we are safe, although I must confess that I do not experience any great alarm on account of this recent outbreak, for the reason that similar things happened during the progress of the disease in the former outbreak in the metropolis, commencing in 1865.

10349. Do you mean that after the disease was supposed to be stamped out in 1867, fresh outbreaks took place after a considerable lapse of time?—During the time of the prevalence of the disease in the country the metropolis was twice apparently free. The affection was detected in June 1865, and it prevailed up to December 1866, at which time it ceased; at least, no cases were detected for some considerable period, and during that period, from June 1865 to December 1866, we lost something like 8,000 cows, out of a total of nearly 16,000, which I estimated as the dairy population at that time. Nothing more was heard of the disease in the metropolis until January 1867, when another outbreak occurred on the same premises at Islington, where the disease was first detected; and although the plague existed at the time in Holland and Belgium, we were not able to trace it to any direct contact with animals from those countries, and its actual origin was really never ascertained. The disease ceased again for a time after its appearance in these premises in January 1867, and we heard nothing more of it until April 1867, three

Professor *Brown.*

19 July 1877.

Chairman—continued.

months later, when it was detected in Limehouse; but in this instance, also, we found that several sheds in various parts of the metropolis had been emptied, and we had reason to suspect that the removal of the animals was in consequence of the extension of cattle plague to those places. From April 1867 we had occasional outbreaks up to the end of August, and a noticeable instance which came under my own observation occurred in Pond-street, Hampstead, on 23rd July, on the premises belonging to a cattle jobber. The animals were slaughtered, and no further outbreaks were reported or detected until I again, by accident, found several animals affected with cattle plague, nearly five weeks later, on the 25th August, in Bermondsey; and this case impressed itself on my mind most strongly, because I remember that in walking over the premises I found that next to the shed where the cows were kept there was a roughly-appointed slaughter-house, into which the owner could easily drive a diseased cow, send for a butcher's man in the same street, and have the animal dressed and taken away as beef, a thing which would of course excite no particular observation. In this instance the disease ceased, and no further cases occurred, or at least no further cases were detected, and by degrees the various restrictions which had been imposed were removed, but the cordon was kept on the metropolis for nearly two years longer.

10350. Up to nearly the end of 1869?—Up to, I believe, 1872, until the opening of the Deptford Foreign Cattle Market.

10351. All that evidence points, then, to the fact, that during that outbreak of the disease many intervals of comparative freedom occurred, and that then it broke out again?—It does.

10352. That was under a system very similar to that which at present exists of sheds over which you have no control, where these diseased animals may be readily got rid of without the knowledge of the authorities?—That is the case; but we hoped, with good reason on this occasion, that we had eradicated the affection, because it had at no time extended to any great distance amongst the dairy cows in the metropolis; it had been chiefly confined th the eastern district; and the fact of no more cases having been detected during this considerable interval, and the further circumstance that the disease had never spread extensively in consequence of the restrictions which had been adopted, afforded fair ground for the belief that it had been eradicated; and that impression appears to have been somewhat widely diffused, because we had considerable difficulty in keeping up the restrictions during the time that they really existed. A large deputation of dairymen, introduced by several Members of Parliament, came to the Lord President in the last week of June, about the 22nd June, I believe, to request that as there no longer existed any reason for interference with the movement of dairy-cows, the dairymen might be allowed to stock their sheds. The restrictions which prevented the introduction of fresh animals into sheds were removed on the 22nd June, and on the 23rd the cow which we have reason to believe introduced the cattle plague into this shed in Bethnal Green was taken there.

10353. You said that it was on the 22nd of June, in your previous evidence, did you not?—I believe it was on the 23rd. If it was moved on the 22nd it was moved illegally. That we shall inquire into. The man states that he brought it into the shed on the 23rd; this was most likely the case, because as the Order was then published, which revoked the restriction, he would hardly care to run the risk of getting summoned for the sake of getting the animal in a day earlier. I have the note on my paper that it was on the 22nd; but on looking this morning to the Order, and finding that it was an illegal removal, I made further inquiry of the inspector who visited the shed, and he then told me that the man himself said that it was on the 23rd.

Chairman—continued.

10354. That proves that the restrictions were taken off at all events too soon?—It certainly does.

Mr. *Chaplin.*

10355. I understand you to say that you have been unable at present to trace the cause of this outbreak to your satisfaction?—We have.

10356. Are your inquiries still being prosecuted?—They are still going on.

10357. Do you anticipate that you will be able to trace it?—Judging from the results of the inquiries during this outbreak, and also during the whole time of the previous existence of the disease in 1865 to 1867, I am afraid that we shall not be able to trace it. It was in very few instances indeed that we could connect the disease with any distinct source of infection.

10358. In cases where you have been able to trace it, how long have you been doing so as a general rule?—In those cases where we have been able to trace the disease, we have generally ascertained it at once, and in all those instances we have traced it to the introduction of diseased cattle, either foreign or English.

10359. In this case you say there were 11 animals in the infected dairy?—There were 11 animals originally in May, when the inquiry was made by one of the Privy Council inspectors.

10360. But at the time when you first received information of this outbreak, how many animals were there?—There were 10. The 11 had been reduced to 8 before the pleuro-pneumonia broke out. One animal was killed in consequence of pleuro-pneumonia, leaving seven; one fresh animal was introduced on 22nd June by Plummer, and two others on 3rd July, which were brought from Mr. Payne's establishment at Romford, making the number 10.

10361. I understood that on the evening of the 13th, when the news was received at the police office that there were infected cows, you sent your head inspector, and then there were 10?—Then there were 10.

10362. Do you know how long each of those 10 had been there?—Seven had been there some very considerable time; some months.

10363. Then I presume that the disease could not have arisen from any one of those eight?—I apprehend not, because it would be more reasonable to conclude that the fresh animals had introduced the disease than that it had originated in those which had remained there for some time.

10364. Then, probably, it arose from one of those three?—That it arose from one of those three is certainly probable.

10365. Which died first?—The one that was introduced on the 23rd June.

10366. And that came from Plummer?—That came from Plummer.

10367. But you have not been able to trace it beyond?—

Mr. *Chaplin*—continued.

beyond?—We have not been able to trace it beyond yet, in consequence of not being able to find the man; but he will probably be seen to-day by the inspector, as he is engaged as a drover in the Metropolitan Market.

10368. Then you do not despair of being able to trace it?—I do not absolutely despair, but I think that we shall probably be told that it only came from this man's premises, and that his animals are in perfect health.

10369. Where did those two come from on the 3rd July?—They came from Romford, from Mr. Payne's premises there; and he states that the large number he now has there are all healthy. He is here to be examined.

10370. You said, I think, that you thought cats conveyed the infection; is that from their eating the offal or the meat?—I stated what one of the travelling inspectors had seen, namely, that cats had gone into the yard where the carcases are kept whilst they are being cut up to be boiled down; and I suggested that that at least was a possible source of the communication of the disease, because those cats would naturally go back to the cow sheds.

10371. What sort of place is it where they keep these carcases?—It is a large yard which is closed by means of gates.

10372. I suppose that it would not be difficult to adopt such measures as would render it impossible for cats and dogs to get in?—Dogs might be kept out, but I doubt whether it would be possible to keep out the cats; I think that we should require an air-tight chamber to keep out cats.

Mr. *Pease*.

10373. I think you stated that out of the eight cattle that there were on 12th June one had pleuro-pneumonia?—Yes, one was attacked with pleuro-pneumonia.

10374. Was information duly given of that attack?—The report was sent in the usual way by the inspector of the local authority.

10375. Therefore you then had access to the dairy?—In reference to pleuro-pneumonia, we should not interfere, because that disease is entirely in the hands of the local authority even in the metropolitan district.

10376. Was it reported to you?—It was by the local inspector.

10377. And you believe that proper steps were taken for the destruction of that beast?—We have no reason to doubt it.

10378. You said, I think, that on the 10th July, from information which you have received since then, one of the cows introduced by Mr. Payne was ill?—No, the cow that was brought in by Mr. Plummer; but I may tell the Committee that Mr. Payne visited this shed some little time back before we heard of the outbreak, and he will be able to give some information about it.

10379. You have hinted your suspicions that in many of these cases where cattle plague has broken out the dairymen have put the cows out of the way and emptied the dairies?—We have evidence of the strongest possible character that that has been done over and over again.

10380. Does not that deprive the man of the compensations which he would otherwise get?—It does; but he gets, probably, nearly as much and sometimes rather more from the butcher,

Mr. *Pease*—continued.

and he avoids all the annoyance attending the publicity.

10381. You think that what he gets from the butcher is equal to two thirds of the value if the beast is in pretty good condition?—I think that in many cases he gets quite as much, and I know that he can get cows in again without paying for them at the time; that is a fact about which I am quite clear.

10382. With regard to the inspectors being liable to carry disease from one dairy to another, is it not a fact that the inspectors may come in contact with a beast in the primary stage of disease and not be able to detect it, and still carry away infection?—As far as the evidence extends, an animal which is not discoverably infected is not in such a condition as that it would transmit the disease to another by mediate contagion.

10383. Are you of opinion that if inspection was authorised by law it could be carried on without jeopardy to the sound dairies?—I have no doubt that with proper precautions it could.

10384. Do you not think that a great deal of disease at the present moment is carried from house to house by the doctors, such as scarlet fever especially?—I have not the slightest doubt of it.

10385. For want of proper precaution?—Apparently in some cases from the want of any precaution at all.

10386. Would you keep a separate staff for inspecting the healthy and the diseased animals?—Not exactly a separate staff, because that would be quite impossible, the fact being that a man who is engaged in inspecting healthy stock must occasionally come into contact with disease; but the plan which we adopted was to confine the individual who discovered the disease to the premises on which it existed until he had completed his work there; he was then required to disinfect himself thoroughly and change his clothes completely, and have them properly disinfected, and then go on with his ordinary means of inquiry. A system might easily be arranged of practically disinfecting a man after he entered every shed.

10387. And you think that the safety afforded of inspection would be so great as to counterbalance the dangers connected with it?—I am quite sure that it would if proper precautions were taken.

10388. Do you see any difficulty in taking the proper precautions?—Undoubtedly there is considerable difficulty, and for that reason I propose to do what we have now done in all cases where we have detected cattle plague, or where we have had reason to suspect it, viz., totally to prevent movement from a certain area round the infected place.

10389. That would still be looking to the question of an universal inspection. It has been proposed here that these London dairies should be under constant inspection; what is your opinion as to that?—I think it would be advantageous, because, in ordinary times, when no cattle plague exsits, I do not apprehend the slightest danger, with reference to pleuro-pneumonia, from the visits of inspectors.

10390. Your idea, as I gather, is that cattle plague has continued so exist amongst these dairies in London during the last few months, although it has not been known to exist?—I think that the evidence which we have obtained up to the present time leads to that conclusion.

10391. Do

Professor *Brown*.

19 July 1877.

Professor *Brown.*

19 July 1877.

Colonel *Kingscote.*

10391. Do you think that it would restrict the dairy trade too much if every cow which was moved to or from a dairy was not allowed to be moved except under license?—It would give rise to a large amount of difficulty, and practically the system of moving under license is so complicated that it may be very readily evaded. The system was adopted in the former outbreak in the metropolis, and, notwithstanding the machinery which was employed it was evaded very frequently indeed.

10392. Are those daries registered in any way?—The greater number of them are licensed by the vestries; but we have discovered in our house-to-house visitations several dairies that have no license.

10393. Was this a licensed one in which the disease has recently appeared?—It was a licensed one.

10394. Even at a licensed dairy the owner could resist the inspector coming into it, as I understand?—I believe that the sanitary inspector, who is an officer of the vestry, has power of entry, not in reference to disease, but with a view to see that the sanitary regulations are properly carried out; but I have no evidence that this system of visiting has the slightest beneficial effect; it does not lead, certainly, to any improvement in the arrangements of a very large number of the daries in London.

10395. Was it the sanitary inspector who called at the place yesterday when the wife said that everything was well?—That was the inspector of the Privy Council, not the sanitary inspector.

10396. You do not know whether or not the sanitary inspector called there afterwards?—No, we have no communication at all with the sanitary inspectors; but I know that the sanitary inspectors have frequently visited sheds in which diseased animals have stood without making any comment upon the fact of disease being there; but they are generally men who have no professional knowledge.

10397. Do you think that it would do any good if every owner of a dairy had to keep a register of his cows, where he buys them, and to whom he sells them?—I do not think that any particular advantage would arise from that, because there would be no means of identifying the cows under ordinary circumstances; and even with a system of licensing, the dairyman may (and I am speaking of what I know to have taken place over and over again) send for the local officers to license the removal of an animal to a slaughter-house; he may state at the time that he has no disease upon his premises; he may pick out a cow which he believes has something the the matter with it, or which he well knows to be affected with pleuro-pneumonia, put it in some back place, get one of a similar colour examined by the inspector, obtain a certificate to remove the healthy animal to the slaughter-house, and then use the certificate to remove the diseased one. In that way the inspectors may be absolutely instrumental in concealing an outbreak of pleuro-pneumonia.

10398. You can suggest no method of registering cattle?—I am afraid that unless there was some mode of branding adopted, which would be attended with considerable pain, there would be no means of insuring that a man had the same animals always in his sheds.

Colonel *Kingscote*—continued.

10399. As to cats, do you not think that it would be very desirable to keep them out of the slaughter-houses? — Undoubtedly, in districts where cattle plague exists, it is very desirable that they should be secured if possible, or destroyed; but although the Act provides for the restriction of the movement of the dogs, it says nothing at all about the more dangerous animals, the cats.

10400. Cats are probably a much more fruitful source of carrying contagion than dogs?—Undoubtedly.

10401. As to your proposition to create infected areas, whether the Act of Parliament does give you the power or not, you would, I understand, like the Privy Council to possess the power to make infected areas throughout the country with the object of stamping out either rinderpest, pleuro-pneumonia, or foot-and-mouth disease?—I should, because as far I can see at present the system would be of the most elastic character possible, inasmuch as by the defining of a certain area we could make any regulations which we thought necessary.

10402. It would free the rest of the country from vexatious restrictions?—It would.

10403. And you think that that would be a very effectual remedy?—I believe so; I believe that it is the nearest approach to the Prussian system which is likely to be tolerated in this country.

Mr. *Anderson.*

10404. Does it not occur to you that the evidence in this case points rather to a spontaneous outbreak than to contagion?—No, I am perfectly satisfied that whatever may have been the source of the disease it had no connection with a spontaneous origin.

10405. But you have no evidence of any source from which it could have arisen?—We have the whole evidence of the history of these contagious diseases as far back as we have any records.

10406. That means that you are already so satisfied of the impossibility of spontaneous generation of the disease that you cannot be convinced of it, whatever happens?—Yes, I should be convinced if in any part of the country an outbreak occurred which was totally unconnected with the introduction of foreign stock.

10407. You have been unable to trace any connection with the introduction of foreign stock in this last case, have you not?—No, I think the connection is most direct. We had foreign animals affected with cattle plague brought into this country in the beginning of the year, and the disease has prevailed with a certain period of intermission up to this last outbreak.

10408. In this case there has been a breach in the continuity to an extent of time which you in your former evidence considered sufficient to render us safe?—Presuming that no outbreak had occurred meanwhile.

10409. And you have no evidence of any outbreak having occurred meanwhile?—We have no positive evidence, but the presumptive evidence is very strong, because we are quite certain that the disease would not have originated spontaneously.

10410. It comes back to this, that you are quite certain that it could not have originated spontaneously?—Yes, certainly, for the reason that all the evidence which we have in reference to cattle plague clearly points to the fact that it

Mr. *Anderson*—continued.

it never arises in a country unless it is introduced from some country where it has always existed.

10411. You think that no sort of bad drainage, or foul air, or over-crowding, or anything of that sort would produce it?—Clearly not; it never arises in any part of Germany unless diseased animals are brought across their eastern frontier. They have no instance in their history of an outbreak which they could not trace to the movement of cattle from an infected place.

10412. As you are satisfied that it must have connection with contagion, is it not very important that you should endeavour to trace it?—Undoubtedly it is.

10413. Are the inquiries which you are making at present of a character likely to bring out the whole of the facts?—I think they are as complete as we could possibly make them.

10414. Has anybody any power to examine witneses on oath?—I do not think that anyone has; but if they had I do not think it would make much difference.

10415. When you go to men who are pecuniarily interested in concealing the truth, and you do take many of these facts from them, you think it would not much matter whether they gave the facts on oath or not?—In the case of some of the men that we have to deal with, I do not think that an oath would have the slightest effect.

10416. Does not a mis-statement upon oath entail upon the person making it the risk of being punished for perjury?—Yes, but when the only repositories of the facts are the men themselves, they are pretty safe on that score.

10417. Then you think that your means of inquiry at present are as good as you can get?—I think so; but, as I have already stated to the Committee, they are obstructed by the fact that the men who could give us the information simply decline to do it, or make statements which will tend rather to lead us in the wrong direction; and when we get the answers we are, as a rule, perfectly aware that they are either utterly false or vaguely misleading.

10418. That rather points, does it not, to the necessity of some power to compel witnesses to attend and give evidence on oath?—To my mind it does not, for the reason which I have given. They answer questions, but the statements which they make we either know at the time from something which we have previously ascertained, or we find out afterwards to be entirely false, even in so simple a matter as to whether a man has had the animals in his shed a certain time, and as to the places from which they have been brought.

10419. Do you think that he would equally give that evidence falsely if he were doing it before an authority upon oath?—I have not the slightest doubt of it.

10420. You seem to have rather a low opinion of the *morale* of the people who keep cattle?—I do not apply the observations to all the people who keep cattle, but I speak of an inconsiderable number of persons who would have to be examined upon such a question as this.

Mr. *Chamberlain.*

10421. I do not understand that you consider that there has been any new importation of diseased cattle from abroad?—No, I think that that is as nearly as possible entirely out of the question, because the Orders prohibiting the importation of cattle from Germany and Belgium are still in force; the Order which compels the slaughter of cattle from Holland is also still in force, and in addition to those facts, we have no reason at all to believe that cattle plague exists now, either in Germany, Belgium, or Holland.

Chamberlain—continued.

10422. If I understand you correctly, although you do not know as an actual fact what is the cause of this last outbreak, your theory is, that the disease has lingered in the country unsuspected by your officers, until it has now once more appeared upon the surface?—I think that that is an obvious conclusion.

10423. Do you suggest any alteration in the method of compensation, so as to secure better information than you appear to have had?—I should be disposed to pay full compensation in cases of a disease like cattle plague, which is so excessively deadly and difficult to get rid of, in the hope I should induce a larger number of people to report; but I still believe that no amount of compensation would induce others to report, whose business would be seriously interfered with, and who, from their position, would not be able to bear that loss of trade in consequence of want of capital.

10424. Are you able to enforce any penalty for concealment of the facts?—Yes; if the magistrate chooses he may fine the individual, I believe, 20 *l.* for the infringement of the Order; but in the majority of cases our prosecutions have failed, because the Act provides that the owner must be proved to have guilty knowledge; and it has always been found very difficult to prove the existence of guilty knowledge on the part of the person concealing the existence of disease.

10425. Would you suggest any alteration in the Act in order to make the recovery of penalties more certain?—I think that the question of guilty knowledge might be altogether left out.

10426. You think that it should be left to the discretion of the magistrates?—Certainly, if it is not left entirely out of the Act, because all owners of cattle know perfectly well whether an animal is well or ill; their observation is generally extremely acute, and it would be no great hardship if they were compelled to give notice of the existence of any disease, and the inspector should be left to decide whether that disease was of a nature to call for any interference or not.

Mr. *Arthur Peel.*

10427. I suppose since the Deptford case in January you have not been able to connect one case with another as coming distinctly from the Deptford case?—We have not in a single instance. In every outbreak we have made very strict inquiry, and we have not once succeeded in tracing the disease to any introduction of diseased animals into the shed, or to the movements of any persons who have been in connection with those animals.

10428. But you trace this last outbreak primarily to that case at Deptford?—Undoubtedly the disease was introduced into the country by that cargo of cattle.

10429. Are you satisfied with the present system of licensing dairies in the metropolis?—No, I think that the whole system of dealing with

Professor *Brown.*

19 July 1877.

Mr. *Arthur Peel*—continued.

with dairies in the metropolis and other large towns requires revision.

10430. Are they all of them licensed at present, in London, by the different vestries?—Judging from the lists which we have they are not; because in addition to the list of licensed dairies which we have from the vestries, we have found other places where cows are kept, and where no license has been given.

10431. Do you know whether the dairies which are licensed by the vestries, are licensed under uniform conditions attaching to the licenses?—I believe that they are, but those conditions are not carried into effect; one condition is that an animal must have a certain cubic space to stand in; but I go into dairies very frequently where the animals have not half the minimum cubic space that ought to be allowed.

10432. Would you supersede this vestry system of licensing by a Privy Council license?—No, I think that in the metropolis certainly the Metropolitan Board of Works should have full power to deal with the dairies as they deal with the slaughter-houses: they have effected immense improvements in those establishments, and I have no doubt that if they had the power they would very soon alter the condition of the dairies.

10433. By a right of entry, without the necessity of a license?—And by power to remove or to cease to give licenses to dairies which were unfit for the reception of cattle; in fact, if they had power to insist upon the observance of certain conditions as they have in slaughter-houses, I have not the slightest doubt that they would exercise that power, because they would have no temptation of a local kind to influence them, and they would deal with all the parishes in the metropolis in exactly the same way.

10434. That recommendation, I suppose, would apply to all towns, as well as to London?—I certainly think that the principal authority in the borough should have the power to legislate for dairies and slaughter-houses.

10435. A question has arisen in the part of the country with which I am acquainted which bears upon the point with reference to superseding the local authority by a central authority. The case is this: a local committee is appointed by the magistrates to carry out the Animals Order of 1877, and the question has arisen whether the officers of that local committee can legally stop cattle which are being moved from place to place in contravention of that Order. I understand that reference has been made to the Veterinary Department of the Privy Council, and that your opinion is that neither the cattle nor the drovers can be stopped by the local authority though the drover was manifestly violating the regulations of the Animals Order of 1877; is that a true statement of the case?—That is a matter which has not come before me at all. It probably occurred when I was at Liverpool last week; it would be referred to our legal adviser, and a letter would be written according to his directions.

10436. You cannot say whether the only remedy against the drover would be by summons, and whether the local authority is not empowered to stop the cattle?—The interpretation which we have always put upon the terms of the Order, is that the local authority have power to seize diseased animals and to detain them; but there is nothing to suggest that they have power to interfere with the man driving them, beyond

Mr. *Arthur Peel*—continued.

taking out a summons against him, and fining him up to the extent of 20 *l.*

10437. Of course by the time the summons is taken out the harm is done, and the infection is spread?—Undoubtedly.

Mr. *Elliot.*

10438. Is not this last outbreak another very startling proof to you of the insidiousness of the disease?—It is another proof, but I may say that we have so many proofs of that fact, that we do not need any more evidence of it.

10439. You mentioned that cats and other animals were likely to carry infection; does not that impress your mind very strongly with the necessity of not allowing live cattle to come into the country at all, because when we have got them at the port, we are never safe from disease?—My suggestion to the Committee on my last examination was, that with a view to entirely getting rid of contagious diseases, I should advise as the extreme measure, that cattle should be entirely prohibited from Germany and Belgium, and that all other animals should be slaughtered at the port of landing, on the understanding always that we adopted in this country such restrictions as would suffice to get rid of the disease.

10440. Such restrictions as have been mentioned by you in your examination?—I believe we have no power under the 75th section, to deal with diseases which are specially provided for in other parts of the Act; at least we are so advised.

Mr. *Wilbraham Egerton.*

10441. Do you think that this fresh outbreak shows the necessity for the cordon round London being kept up?—I do not think that we could contemplate the idea of relieving London, for certainly the remainder of this year.

10442. I was going to ask you how long you thought that the cordon should be kept up, understanding as I did from your previous answer that on a former occasion the cordon was kept up for two or three years?—It was kept up then in consequence of foreign cattle being landed from countries where cattle plague was likely to exist. The disease still prevailed on the Continent, and we allowed cattle to be landed at the port of London, and taken by rail to the Metropolitan Market, in order that they should not, if affected, escape into the country; and the cordon was only removed when the Deptford Market was opened.

10443. Supposing that animals from Germany were allowed to be slaughtered in this country; Germany being a country where cattle plague is known constantly to exist, do you think that the cordon round the metropolis should be kept up as long as that state of things exists?—Certainly, if we allowed cattle to be landed from Germany when cattle plague existed there.

10444. Or at any time, Germany being constantly liable to cattle-plague?—No; if cattle are not entirely prohibited from Germany, as I suggest, I should certainly, on the very instant that we received information of an outbreak on the Eastern frontier of Germany, advocate the total prohibition from Germany of cattle, meat, and all animal products, without waiting to see whether the disease passed into the interior of the country or not, as we have hitherto done.

10445. Is

Mr. *Wilbraham Egerton*—continued.

10445. Is there any practical difficulty in keeping up the cordon round London at the present time?—Yes, there is a great deal of difficulty in doing so, chiefly in regard to the railway traffic; this difficulty might, however, be got over, as it was in 1866, by allowing animals to be moved through the metropolis at certain junctions. The other difficulty is, that persons who have animals in London cannot move them into the country; but that is a matter of comparatively small importance.

10446. Of course if the dairies were kept outside the metropolis, that would also facilitate the maintenance of a cordon round London, would it not?—I do not think that it would affect the question largely, because the great difficulty arises from the impossibility of transmitting animals from the Metropolitan Market to various parts of the country. A butcher living in Sussex cannot come to the metropolis to buy a bullock and take it away alive. But in theory, at least, I see the great advisability of making the Metropolitan Market a market for London, and not allowing animals from that market to go out of the metropolitan district.

10447. Do you think that the police are the best inspectors to employ in London?—So long as we are restricted to merely making inquiries and watching the movement of cattle out of the sheds, I believe that the police will do more effective work than professional men, because we could hardly ask a professional man to station himself in a street and watch a certain number of dairies; in fact, if we did it, it would be a pure waste of his knowledge and skill.

10448. You also find, do you not, that the police in the country generally act as efficient inspectors?—They do, so far as making inquiries is concerned, and carrying the orders into effect; and I have no doubt that they would act much more efficiently if they had a reasonable additional remuneration, their remuneration, I believe, being at present very small.

10449. You do not think that your system of creating an infected area in any part of the country where disease should break out would involve much extra expense, because the police would still be used for the maintenance intact of that infected area?—We must, of course, have a certain number of competent professional men so placed that they could be sent to any part of the country upon very short notice for the purpose, which is most important, of identifying disease, because there are numerous reported outbreaks of pleuro-pneumonia which we are perfectly satisfied are not pleuro-pneumonia at all; and, in the first place, I think that the disease should be identified by good authority before any action is taken.

10450. Would you with your existing staff of inspectors be able to ascertain, first of all, when an outbreak takes place in the country, whether it is a *bonâ fide* outbreak of the particular disease suspected, and then, by employing the police, would there be any chance of additional cost being incurred?—No doubt there would be additional cost, because we must have a head inspector somewhere in every place where there is a separate jurisdiction.

10451. But these infected areas would not be very numerous if you could stamp out the disease rapidly?—The process would be most costly in the first instance; we might adopt the system of

Mr. *Wilbraham Egerton*—continued.

paying competent men a retaining fee, and remunerating them for their services when they are required.

10452. Would it not be most economical in the end to adopt the course which you have suggested?—Undoubtedly. If the estimate that is given is anything like correct, a tenth part of the annual loss would pay all the inspectors very liberally indeed.

Chairman.

10453. I understood you to say just now with regard to these dairy-sheds in London, that you thought it would be difficult, if power was taken to inspect and regulate movement, to establish a system of licenses for that purpose; was that so?—A difficulty always arises where licenses are concerned, because we have no means of identifying the animal to which the license refers. Sometimes merely "a cow" or "a heifer" or "a red and white ox" is put down on the license, and of course the license applies to any animal which may answer the description.

10454. How do you suppose that the Metropolitan Board of Works, if they had the power which you suggest they should have, would deal with the restrictions of movement in those dairy sheds?—My proposition was that the Metropolitan Board of Works should have power to regulate the construction and arrangement of the dairies.

10455. Your answer did not refer to the restriction of movement of the animals to and from those dairy sheds for the sake of security to the public?—No, it was without reference to that.

10456. I understood you to say that you thought it would be necessary, in order to obtain that protection if dairy sheds were allowed to continue in London, to have some security against their continuing to be centres of infection?—I think it is quite necessary to have them under very strict regulations, and to have them so constructed that the sanitary arrangements should be as nearly as possible perfect, and that inspectors should be able to enter with a probability of making proper inspection without difficulty, which at the present moment would be impossible.

10457. The inspection would be an inspection by the authorities in charge of the regulations; the regulations as to movement would be made by them, but the Metropolitan Board of Works would be, as they are in the case of slaughter-houses, entrusted with the supervision of the construction of the sheds?—Yes, and with the general sanitary arrangements without reference to contagious diseases.

10458. I understood you to say, in answer to an honourable Member, that in dealing with the penalties under the Contagious Diseases Act in enforcing your powers under that Act, the men got off because they pleaded that they had no guilty knowledge?—That has been very frequently the case.

10459. I do not see that in the Act; the Act gives absolute power to the Privy Council first, to fix the penalties, and then to recover the penalties in the ordinary form; and there is no such words as "knowingly" in the Act?—I think the words somewhere occur, "unless he can show that he did not possess such knowledge,

Professor *Brown.*

19 July 1877.

Chairman—continued.

or that he could not, with the exercise of reasonable diligence, have obtained such knowledge."

10460. Is not that entirely confined to the subsection of the clause which refers to the falsification of the license?—I know that it has been pleaded in cases relating to the detection of contagious diseases, and I know that the opposing counsel has succeeded in getting a verdict in his favour entirely on that ground.

10461. The sections of the Act which apply to the recovery of penalties in no way allude to it, except in that one case of the falsification of a license, and it must be proved there that the falsification was with the knowledge of the man?—I believe that it occurs either in the Act or in the Order, in reference to the detection of disease.

Chairman—continued.

10462. In your opinion, as far as you have been able to trace it, the probability is, that Plummer's cow was the means of introducing the disease into this shed?—The present state of the inquiry rests with that assumption; but it is possible that we may, in the course of the day, obtain evidence which will lead us in quite another direction.

10463. You are following out the inquiry with a view of obtaining such knowledge, if it exists?—We are.

Mr. WILLIAM PAYNE, called in; and Examined.

Mr. *Payne.*

Chairman.

10464. I BELIEVE you are a large Cattle Salesman at Romford, in Essex?—Yes.

10465. And you have, in the course of your business, to deal largely with the different dairy-sheds in the metropolis, supplying them with animals?—Yes.

10466. Your attention has been directed, has it not, to the present outbreak of cattle plague in the shed at Bethnal Green?—Yes.

10467. Can you tell the Committee the circumstances under which two animals which, I believe, you supplied to that shed were sent in?—Yes. The two cows that I sent in I bought on the 16th of April.

10468. Were they English cows?—They were.

10469. Had you them in your possession from that date?—From that time.

10470. And were they standing in your own yard?—They were in a park that I held.

10471. Were they running with any other animals?—Yes.

10472. What has been the condition of those animals?—They are all as healthy as can be.

10473. And those animals were sent direct from that pasture to this place in Bethnal Green?—They were.

10474. On what date did you send them in?—About the beginning of July.

10475. And you have not had any symptom of contagious disease among the animals that remain still at home?—Not the least.

10476. There are no other animals but your own on that pasture; it is not one of the Lammas lands?—No, nothing but my own animals.

10477. Did you yourself see the condition of this shed, or are you able to speak as to the place?—I have been in it three or four times; not many times.

10478. Could you speak as to the animals that you saw there?—Yes.

10479. Have they been subject to disease?—Not that I know of.

10480. You are not aware, from your own knowledge, of the fact of pleuro-pneumonia having existed there?—No, not at all.

10481. What was the number of animals there at the time that you saw them?—I should think about 10 or 11, but I cannot say exactly.

10482. Does the man constantly change his stock there?—Yes, when they drop off their milk he changes them.

10483. He shifts them as they diminish in giving milk?—Yes.

Chairman—continued.

10484. So that there is a constant flood of animals through that and through most of the other sheds, I suppose, to fill up the gaps?—Yes.

10485. Have you supplied him constantly before?—Not long, perhaps eight or ten months.

10486. But you have sent a good many animals in there during that time?—I have sent several in.

10487. Were these the animals that were there when the outbreak occurred?—I think there were four or five of them that I had supplied.

10488. Had you supplied them in the same way from your own Essex pasture?—Yes.

10489. Can you tell the Committee the system on which this flow of cattle, through these dairies, takes place; is it by direct purchase with payment on delivery?—Most of them.

10490. In your own instance it was a case of payment on delivery?—Yes.

10491. And when it it is suggested that those animals are sent in on a system of payment by instalments, with a power to the sender to remove them to other dairies as he sees fit if they are not paid for, that is not a part of your business?—No, I never did so.

10492. Are you aware that it is a system which is adopted to any extent?—No, not that I know of.

10493. In your own business your practice is on sending the animals to be paid for them?—Yes.

10494. Therefore the additional charges that might ensue from their being only there waiting until they were paid for, and liable to be transferred, do not exist in your own case?—No, I have never heard of it.

10495. And you do not practice it yourself?—No, never.

10496. Are you able to speak at all as to the effect which would be produced upon the trade by more strict regulations as to movement for the purpose of protecting London against these sheds being means of propagating disease?—Yes, I think that it would be a very good plan.

10497. You see no objection to the inspection of them, and to some regulations being made as to the animals coming in and going out?—It would be a very good plan I should say.

10498. Protecting the districts from disease, and protecting the men themselves from the losses incurred by it?—Yes.

10499. Are you able to give the Committee any

Chairman—continued.

any further information as to the animals in this shed?—No, not at all.

10500. You are not able, I suppose, to speak as to the animal which has been described to the Committee as coming from a man named Plummer?—No.

10501. Do you know Plummer?—Yes, I think I know the man.

10502. Does he do a large business?—I do not know at all. He attends the cattle market, and I never go up there.

10503. You have had no business with him?—No, never.

10504. Have you any other information that you can give the Committee upon this point?—No, not at all.

10505. It really results in this: that you delivered two animals there from a pasture of your own where they had been perfectly healthy since April, and where they had been in contact with animals which were then healthy, and are still healthy; and that all the animals that you sent to him, of which four or five were in his yard at the time of the slaughter came from the same place under the same conditions; is that so?—Yes.

10506. Were you at the shed during the course of last week?—Yes, I was there on Saturday, but I did not hear anything about it until I called at the shed.

10507. Was that the time at which you say 10 animals stood there?—I only stood at the door, and I could see only one.

10508. That was not at the time of your sending in the animals?—No, I sent them in three weeks ago.

10509. Was that the time when you were paid for them, or were you in treaty for other animals?—I had a fat cow at the same time. I think the same night or the next morning.

10510. Where did that animal go to?—To Aldgate, to be slaughtered.

10511. Was that animal in a healthy condition?—Quite healthy.

10512. How long did you move the animal before the first notice on the Friday of the animals being affected?—I think it was the 3rd of July when that one went away.

10513. Was that the same day that you sent them in?—I think it was either that night or the next morning. I would not be sure whether it was that night or the next morning.

10514. It was a certain number of days, at all events, before the disease showed itself?—Yes.

10515. Was that animal taken direct to the slaughter-house?—It was slaughtered.

10516. It was not placed in contact with any other animal?—No.

Mr. *Chaplin.*

10517. Where did you buy these two cows?—At St. Ives.

10518. Is your park where they were running near any place that has been infected?—No, nowhere near it.

10519. You had a great number of other animals running with them?—Yes.

10520. Had any of those come from places which had been infected or within reach of infection?—Not the least.

Mr. *Pease.*

10521. I suppose those other animals that were running with them have been introduced since the date at which you bought those two cows?—Some of them might have been, and some before.

10522. And you have parted with those since, probably, or some of them?—Yes.

10523. May I ask how many of these cows you turn through your hands in the course of a good year?—I cannot give it now; 30 or 40 a week, perhaps; sometimes more and sometimes less.

10524. Do you ever deal in Dutch cows?—No, not without I see one that has been in the country for two or three years.

10525. You do not think that they are now forming a large proportion of the supply of the London dairies?—No, we see very few now.

10526. Why do you not deal in them?—I never buy them unless they have been in the country for a year or two.

10527. Are you afraid of them?—I never deal in them.

10528. Do you not deal in them because you think that there is not the same profit as there is on English cows?—I do not know about that.

10529. There is a market for them, is there not?—Yes, there is a market for them, but I never buy them.

10530. Is it not a constant practice with men who are supplying the London dairies if they see a good cow, to send it on without a question of price, and settle the price aftewards?—Sometimes; but they generally come down and buy them themselves.

10531. They would not say to a man like you, "Send me down three of the best cows you get in"?—Yes, they very often do.

10532. And you settle the price afterwards?—Yes.

10533. Does not that same sort of thing take place with a much inferior order of tradesmen to yourself?—It might.

Colonel *Kingscote.*

10534. What took you to Norfolk-street, Bethnal-green, last Saturday?—I sometimes call as I am going by, but I had no thoughts of anything there.

10535. You say you have been into the premises?—Yes.

10536. What sort of premises are they, as dairies go?—It is a lowish shed, holding about a dozen or 14 cows, I expect.

10537. Is it airy?—Yes.

10538. And well ventilated?—Pretty well for that, I think.

Chairman.

10539. Then do I understand you that it was last Saturday that you were there?—Yes; he told me that the inspector had been there, and I had better not go into the shed, and I went away as soon as I could.

10540. You did not get any information from the owner of the shed at all?—Not in the least; I did not stop two minutes with him.

10541. You very naturally got as far away as possible?—I did.

LIST OF APPENDIX.

Appendix, No. 1.

Papers delivered in by Count C. F. Danneskiold-Samsoe: PAGE.

Order concerning Contagious Diseases in Domestic Animals. (29 December 1857) - 503

General Orders for the Treatment of Infectious Diseases in Domestic Animals. (28 September 1858) - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 505

Regulations to be observed with regard to Pleuro-pneumonia.—(Part of Decree of 28 September 1858) - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 506

Decree concerning the Foot-and-Mouth Disease of 10 April 1875 - - - - 507

Regulations to be observed with regard to the Foot-and-Mouth Disease, issued 16 October 1875 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 507

Order concerning Measures against Importation of Cattle Plague from Germany.—(16 January 1877) - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 508

Law concerning the Export of Domestic Animals from Denmark.—(25 February 1876) 508

Order concerning Measures with regard to Export of Domestic Animals to Great Britain.—(26 February 1876) - - - - - - - - - - - - 508

Circular to the Prefects in view of an eventual Importation of the Cattle Plague.—(10 February 1877) - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 509

Export of Cattle and Sheep from Denmark, 1866–76 - - - - - - - - 509

Appendix, No. 2.

Paper handed in by Professor Brown, 17 May 1877:

Cattle Plague in Great Britain - - - - - - - - - - - 510

Appendix, No. 3.

Papers handed in by Mr. May, 6 June 1877:

Return of the Number of Cattle, &c., in the Netherlands in 1875 - - - - - 511

Cases of Pleuro-pneumonia in the Netherlands, 1871–76 - - - - - - - 511

Appendix, No. 4.

Papers handed in by Mr. C. L. Peel, 13 June 1877:

Orders of Council - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 512

Schedule.—Orders of Council revoked - - - - - - - - - 519

Appendix, No. 4—*continued.*

Papers handed in by Mr. C. L. Peel, 13 June 1877—*continued.*

The Animals Order of 1875 :

Contents: PAGE.

Preliminary - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 521

Part I.—Contagious or Infectious Disease among Animals - - - - 522

Part II.—Transit of Animals - - - - - - - - - - 527

Part III.—Foreign Animals - - - - - - - - - - 528

Part IV.—General Provisions - - - - - - - - - 532

First Schedule.—Foot-and-Mouth Disease.—Form of Movement License - 533

Second Schedule.—Railway Stations at which Water is to be provided for Animals - - - - - - - - - - - - - 534

Third Schedule.—Schleswig and Holstein.—Declaration and Certificates - 538

Orders in Council - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 539

Schedule.—Part I.—Record of each Animal affected with Cattle Plague Slaughtered in pursuance of Section 65 (or reserved for Experimental Treatment under Section 73) of the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869 - - - 549

Part II.—Record of each Animal that, having been in the same Shed or Stable, or in the same Herd or Flock, or in contact with any Animal affected with Cattle Plague, has been Slaughtered under Section 66 of the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869 - - - - - - - - - - - - 550

Part III.—Record of each Animal that, being affected with Disease suspected to be Cattle Plague, has been Slaughtered under Section 67 of the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869 - - - - - - - - - - - - 550

Orders in Council - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 551

Schedule.—Orders of Council revoked - - - - - - - - - 555

Memorandum.—Orders not included in this Set - - - - - - - - 557

List of Local Authorities in whose Districts (either wholly or in part) Regulations have been made under the Cattle Plague Order of 1877 - - - - - - - - - 558

List of Local Authorities in whose Districts (either wholly or in part) Regulations have been made for Foot-and-Mouth Disease - - - - - - - - - - 558

List of Local Authorities who Prohibited Movement of Cattle into their Districts - 560

List of Local Authorities who Prohibited Movement of Cattle into their Districts, unless with a Certificate, License, &c. - - - - - - - - - - - - - 560

List of Local Authorities who regulated Movement of Cattle within their Districts - 560

List of Local Authorities who closed Markets, &c., in their Districts - - - - - 561

List of Local Authorities who made certain Regulations under the Cattle Plague Order of 1877, not enumerated in previous Lists - - - - - - - - - - 561

Prohibitions - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 561

Appendix, No. 5.

Papers handed in by Mr. Stratton, 22 June 1877 :

(A.)—Letter from Mr. C. E. Wilmot to Mr. W. Beach, M.P., dated 11 November 1876 566

(B.)—From the "Chamber of Agriculture Journal and Farmers' Chronicle," the Organ of the Chambers of Agriculture, dated 12 February 1877 - - - - - - 568

Appendix, No. 6.

Paper handed in by Sir Alexander Wood :

Scheme submitted in February 1876 to the Privy Council in reference to the working of the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act - - - - - - - - - - - 569

Appendix, No. 7.

Paper handed in by Sir C. Alexander Wood, 25 June 1877 : PAGE.

Great Western Railway.—Circular dated March 1877 - - - - - - - 571

Rates for the Conveyance of Kinsale Mackerel (Season 1877) from New Milford, at Owner's Risk, at the ton of 20 cwt., and on the Conditions stated in the accompanying Circular - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 572

Return of West of England Fish Traffic for 1876 - - - - - - - - 575

Return of Kinsale Fish Traffic for 1876 - - - - - - - - - - 575

Return of West of England Fish Traffic for 1877 - - - - - - - - 575

Return of Kinsale Fish Traffic for 1877 - - - - - - - - - - 575

Appendix, No. 8.

Paper handed in by Sir C. Alexander Wood :

Live Stock Boat Rates, Ireland and England - - - - - - - - - 576

Appendix, No. 9.

Papers handed in by Mr. May :

Royal Decree of the 3rd February 1877, containing the appointing of further Regulations for the checking of Lung Disease among Cattle, and also the revoking of the Royal Decrees of the 17th April 1874, of the 9th October 1874, and of the 30th June 1875 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 578

Royal Decree of the 28th February 1877, containing Regulations concerning the Removal of Cattle, Sheep, Goats, &c. - - - - - - - - - - - 578

Abstract of the Law of the 20th of July 1870, regulating the Government Supervision of Cattle and Veterinary Police - - - - - - - - - - - - 579

Abstract of Regulations respecting the burning, burying, or otherwise destroying of Cattle, which has been Slaughtered according to the Law of the 20th of July 1870 (Act No. 131), or which have died of a Contagious Disease, and of other objects ; and the disinfection of Stables and other Buildings, and of Manure Pits - - - - 579

Royal Decree of 18th December 1870, respecting the Prohibition of the Importation and Transit from Foreign Countries of Cattle, Sheep, and Goats, Fresh Hides, Fresh and Salted Meat, Unmelted Fat Manure, Unmanufactured Wool, Unmanufactured Hair, Hoofs, and Horns, also of all Offal of the said Animals - - - - - - 582

Royal Decree of the 28th May 1871, containing the Prohibition of the loading of Cattle on board a ship destined for Abroad, without a previous inspection by a Veterinary Surgeon appointed thereto by the Government - - - - - - - - 582

Royal Decree of the 19th October 1871, respecting the transport of Cattle by Railway, and the disinfecting of Cattle Trucks - - - - - - - - - - - 582

Decree of the 30th of October 1872, stating which Cattle Diseases are to be considered Contagious, and indicating which of the Measures mentioned in the Law of 20th of July 1870, are to be applied on the breaking out or threatening of each of such cases - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 583

Royal Decree of the 3rd October 1873, containing Provisions respecting the Inspection, making Returns and Removal of Cattle, and the Prohibition of Markets and Public Sales of Cattle, with the object of checking the spread of Lung Disease in Cattle - 584

Appendix, No. 10.

Papers handed in by Mr. C. L. Peel, on behalf of the Swedish and Norwegian Consul General :

Regulations for Importation and Export of Cattle adopted in Sweden with reference to Contagious Diseases in Domestic Animals - - - - - - - - - 586

I.—Royal Decree of 30th May 1873, concerning Importation of Cattle and various Goods - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 586

Appendix, No. 10—*continued.*

Papers handed in by Mr. C. L. Peel—*continued.* PAGE.

II.—Royal Decree of 19 April 1875, concerning Infectious Diseases amongst the Home Stock of Domestic Animals - - - - - - - - - - 589

III.—Extract of a Publication by the Royal Board of Health, conveying Advice and Instruction for Communal Authorities, Veterinary Surgeons, and Royal Officials, concerning the mode of carrying out the Measures which have been prescribed in the Royal Decree of 19th April 1875, for preventing and arresting Contagious Diseases amongst Domestic Animals - - - 590

Special Information relative to Live Stock in Norway, the Exportation and Importation of Horses, Cattle, Sheep, Goats, and Swine, and the Acts and Orders for the suppression of virulent Contagious Diseases among Domestic Animals. Furnished by His Norwegian Majesty's Secretary of State for the Home Department:

Number of Live Stock in Norway at the expiration of 1875 - - - - 591

Live Stock imported into Norway - - - - - - - - - - 591

Live Stock exported from Norway - - - - - - - - - - 592

Appendix I.—I. Number of Domestic Animals in Norway at the expiration of 1875 594

II. Importation of Live Stock - - - - - - - - - - 594

III. Exportation of Live Stock - - - - - - - - - - 595

Appendix II.—Act (27 February 1866 and 26 May 1877) for the Suppression of Virulent Contagious Diseases amongst Domestic Animals - - - - 596

Appendix III.—Regulations to be observed respecting Glanders or Farcy amongst Horses - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 598

Appendix IV.—Regulations to be observed respecting *Anthrax* (malignant pustule) amongst Domestic Animals - - - - - - - - - - - - 599

Appendix V.—Regulations to be observed respecting Foot-and-Mouth Disease amongst Sheep - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 599

Act of the 15th of September 1851, for the Suppression of Scab amongst Sheep and Goats - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 600

Orders issued for the Suppression of Scab amongst Sheep and Goats in Lister and Mandals Amt - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 600

Appendix, No. 11.

Memorial put in, with the Consent of the Committee, by the Borough of Newcastle - - 602

Appendix, No. 12.

Paper handed in by Professor Brown, 19 July 1877:

Orders of Council - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 604

APPENDIX

Appendix, No. 1.

PAPERS delivered in by Count *C. F. Danneskiold-Samsoe.*

ORDER concerning Contagious Diseases in Domestic Animals. (29 December 1857.)

Art. I.—Every veterinary surgeon who has passed the proper examination, and desires to avail himself of the right of practice which he has thereby acquired, shall be supplied (by the proper local authorities, and at the public expense) with a register, authorised for the purpose, into which he is to enter a short account of such cases of infectious diseases in domestic animals which may become subject to his investigation or treatment, as well as of the measures which he has adopted or ordered to be taken for the purpose of preventing the spread of the contagion.

With regard to these diseases, the veterinary surgeons are to observe the instructions which will be issued by the Home Office, and to carry out such special directions as may be given them by the veterinarians sent out by the Office in particular cases. They are likewise bound to act on the orders of the Prefects or of the Chiefs of Police, on receiving the legally fixed payment for their services.

Art. II.—The diseases in domestic animals, which are to be subjected to the special care of the public authorities, are the following:—

Splenitis in all domestic animals.
Sheep-pox, malignant foot-disease, and scab in sheep.
Glanders and malignant strangles in horses.
Pleuro-pneumonia in horned cattle, and
Cattle plague.

In case of any other contagious disease in domestic animals assuming a similar malignant character, the Home Office is empowered to subject it to the regulations of this law through public decree.*

Art. III.—If any domestic animal is attacked by any of these diseases, or if there is a probability of such being the case, the owner shall either call in a veterinary surgeon authorised to treat such cases (*vide* Art. I.), or give information to the Chief of Police or the Mayor of the Commune.

The Prefect is empowered, if he considers it to be necessary, to order a veterinary surgeon to be present, on behalf of the authorities, at horse and cattle fairs, in order to inspect the domestic animals there collected, with regard to the possibility of any of them suffering from any infectious disease (*vide* Art. II. and X.). The Prefect may likewise order the examination by a veterinary surgeon of the animals sent to graze on common pastures.

The Prefect is further empowered, if he sees cause for so doing, to cause a general examination to be made of all domestic animals of any species, which might be threatened with an epidemic, throughout as large a district as he may consider necessary, which examination, however, must be carried out in such a manner as to avoid any danger of spreading the contagion.

Art. IV.—If the veterinary surgeon finds that an animal examined by him is suffering from any of the diseases before mentioned, or that there is a strong probability of such being the case, whether he be called in by the owner, or he be sent by the Chief of Police, or he has met with the animal accidentally, then he shall order and, as far as possible, at once cause the animal in question to be separated from healthy animals, as completely as the nature of the disease requires and circumstances allow, unless the owner consents to the immediate killing of the animal. Wherever there is reason for so doing, he shall order the places where the sick animal has been standing and the objects which may have touched it, to be properly disinfected.

When the veterinary surgeon has entered on his register the record enjoined by Art. I. (which

* In this manner the foot-and-mouth disease has since been included in the list of the diseases to which these regulations apply: viz., by the law of 10th April 1875.

Appendix, No. 1.

(which record is to contain the date of the examination, the name and abode of the owner, a statement of the species and individual marks of the animal, the kind of disease from which it is supposed to suffer, and the measures ordered), this entry is to be read to the owner or the person who, on behalf of the owner, is responsible for the treatment of the animal. By signing the entry the owner or his representative undertakes to see the orders of the veterinary surgeon carried out. Should the owner refuse to sign the entry, the surgeon shall immediately send an extract of the same to the Chief of the Police, if the case occurs in a town, or to the Mayor of the Commune in question, if it occurs in a rural district, and these officers will then at once order the necessary preliminary measures. The owner is bound to obey their injunctions absolutely, even if he may find cause for complaining of them to the superior authorities.

After having finished his investigation, the veterinary surgeon shall send a report as soon as possible to the Chief of Police, together with proposals for any further measures which he may think necessary. A report of the case, with an account of what has been done in consequence of it, is to be sent to the Prefect, and by him forwarded to the Home Office.

Art. V.—If the veterinary surgeon in his report declares it to be certain or probable that the disease belongs to one of the kinds specified in Art. II., and if the Chief of Police has not so much doubt on the subject that he is inclined to postpone further measures on his own responsibility until a further examination shall have taken place, then the Chief of the Police shall issue a decree, to be entered on the register of the police, placing the whole stock, as well as any other stocks which may be suspected of having been infected by the contagion, under the supervision of the authorities.

Art. VI.—If in this manner the stock of one or more farms have been placed under public supervision, the Chief of the Police is empowered to order any further measures which may be necessary for the more complete isolation and disinfection of the infected animals, such as their confinement in a suitable distance from other animals, and in a place affording proper security, the removal of excrements, the use of separate tools, disinfection or destruction of objects which have been exposed to their influence, the employment of separate men, the prohibition of excess on the part of strangers, destruction of the contagion in all persons who have been in contact with them, and the interment of the dead animals whole, or of those parts which cannot be used without danger of spreading the infection The Chief of the Police is likewise empowered to forbid any animal belonging to the infected stock or stocks, even if it is not suffering from the disease, to be removed, by sale or otherwise, or allowed to go on another farm or on the public thoroughfare.

In cases of sheep-pox, sheep-scab, or malignant foot-disease in sheep, and in cases of pleuro-pneumonia in horned cattle, or of cattle plague, a distance may be fixed within which the herd or flock, when grazing, must be kept from the pastures of others.

Should the disease spread further, or assume a very malignant character, the Prefect shall cause a public notice on the subject to be inserted in the principal newspapers of the locality, and no fair for the species of animal concerned shall then be held in the district. In case of malignant lung disease in horned cattle, or of cattle plague, such notification and prohibition shall invariably take place.

Art. VII.—The Chief of the Police decides, in accordance with the proposal of the veterinary surgeon, and the other information at his disposal, to what extent those measures, which by the foregoing he is empowered to take, shall be applied, as also when they may be discontinued. As far as practicable, he shall investigate the state of affairs himself on the spot, give the necessary instructions for carrying out the regulations, and see that the orders which have been given are obeyed. If the owner shows negligence in this respect, or even opposition, the Chief of Police is empowered to cause everything necessary to be done at the expense of the owner, and payment of the amount, after having been approved by the Prefect, may be enforced by distress; if not thus recoverable, the expense must be borne by the county. If it is on account of the poverty of the owner that the authorities have been obliged to act in this manner, the Prefect may order payment to be made from the County Fund, and the Board of Local Government will have to decide whether the claim against the owner may be abandoned.

If there is reason to suppose that the contagion is imported from elsewhere, or that it may have spread to other stocks, this question must be accurately investigated, the measures necessary under such circumstances must be taken without delay, and if the infection can be traced into other districts, the Chiefs of Police in these are to be informed of it.

If the Home Office decides to send a veterinarian to the place, the Prefect must be apprized of it, and the responsibility then passes from the veterinary surgeon to the person sent out.

Art. VIII.—In case of a suspicion of cattle plague or pleuro-pneumonia having seized a stock of cattle, the Chief of Police may order the slaughter of one or two heads, in order to obtain greater certainty by their dissection. The Chief of the Police may continue to order the slaughter of animals, which, according to the declaration of the veterinary surgeon, must be considered with certainty to suffer from one of the two diseases mentioned, until the Home Office shall order the discontinuance of this measure, when there is no longer any hope of arresting the disease in this way.

The Home Office may, at the outbreak of an epidemic, order the killing of the entire stock in which the disease has appeared, or parts of it.

Every

Every horse that the veterinary surgeon declares to suffer from the glanders, or a malignant form of strangles, shall be killed.

The animals which are thus killed shall be dissected, and the reports on such dissections shall be forwarded to the Home Office by the Prefects. The owner may within a certain time fixed by the Chief of Police call in a certificated veterinary surgeon to be present at the dissection, and take part in deciding the question whether the animal has been suffering from the disease indicated. In case of doubt or dissension between the surgeons, the question is to be decided by the Veterinary Board of Health.

[Concerning compensation to the owner.]

Art. IX.—If any of the malignant contagious diseases of domestic animals, enumerated in Art. II., makes its appearance in a foreign country, the Government may issue a prohibition of importation of the species of animals attacked by the disease, as well as of raw produce of the same, such as hair, hides, tallow not melted, or meat; and it may likewise, if any of these diseases should appear within the frontiers of the monarchy in one or more provinces or counties, either entirely prohibit importation of the species of animal attacked to the other provinces or counties, or subject the traffic to such conditions as may be thought necessary in order to prevent the spreading of the infection, for instance, the use of bills of health.

Art. X.—With regard to contagious diseases of a milder kind, such as the foot-and-mouth disease,* various kinds of strangles, ringworm, and scab in other animals than sheep, the owner is bound not to take any animal so affected to any fair or to the pastures of others. The owner of any horse suffering from scab, typhoid or putrid fever, or any other infectious disease, save strangles in a mild degree, or cancer of the tongue, is, moreover, bound to give information to the Chief of the Police or the Mayor of the Commune, stating at the same time what he has done himself in the way of isolation and treatment.

If the Chief of the Police finds it necessary in order to prevent the further spread of the contagion, he is empowered to order an examination by a veterinary surgeon, to give the required orders with regard to isolation and disinfection, and to enforce the observance of these orders.

Art. XI.—[Concerning mad dogs.]

Art. XII.-XIV.—[Concerning prosecutions and fines under the provisions of this law, fees, and payment of expenses.]

General Orders for the Treatment of Infectious Diseases in Domestic Animals.—(28 September 1858.)

Art. I.—In examining a stock of cattle which has been placed under public supervision, the veterinary surgeon ought to examine the healthy animals first, and afterwards, those which are suffering, lest he should cause the contagion to be transferred from these to the former, and he must not only be careful that he does not himself occasion the spread of the contagion, but he must also give all those who have to do with the sick animals, the necessary instruction and orders in this respect, as well as with regard to the proper pre cautions against their taking the disease themselves, where such is possible.

Art. II.—In arranging for the isolation of the diseased animals, the veterinary surgeon must always consider the intensity and the peculiarities of the contagion, specially with regard to whether it is volatile or not, and choose accordingly the locality where the diseased animals are placed, which at the same time must be so situated, and isolated, that nobody can come near to the diseased animals, not even by accident, except those whose duty it is. The same is to be observed with regard to disinfection of persons and implements which have been in contact with the sick animals, fumigation with chlorine being applied so much the more strongly as the contagion is more volatile and adhesive.

The individuals which are less dangerously affected must be kept separate from those in a more dangerous state; the isolated animals must have their own attendants, stable tools, and other implements, which must not be used with those other animals to which the contagion might be transferred. Nor must common watering places be used.

Art. III.—No animal forming part of an infected stock must be sold or brought outside the limits of the stable without special permission; the slaughter of diseased animals must be done on the spot; all the offal must be interred.

Art. IV.—The veterinary surgeon must assist the authorities in carrying out the supervision of the stock.

Art. V.—It will depend on the character of the disease, its degree of prevalence and local circumstances, how often the veterinary surgeon must visit a stock of this description, and he is to apprize the authorities of it.

Art. VI.—Disinfection of stables or parts of stables, where one of these diseases has occurred, or of implements which have been employed in attending on these animals, is to be

* This disease is now classed amongst the more dangerous ones (*vide* Art. II.).

Appendix, No. 1.

be effected by thorough cleaning, and, if necessary, washing down of the same, the iron and woodwork being, in the next place, washed with boiling water, which must not be allowed to cool down below 60° R. (167° Fahrenheit), and, when dry, painted over with a solution of chloride of lime (one part of the chloride to twelve of water).

If an entire stable is to be disinfected, it must be kept closed; if a part of a stable only, it must be partitioned off. After the lapse of four days the same process is repeated, and if there have been several cases of disease in the stable, it must be fumigated with chlorine, during which the stable must be kept well closed. After the lapse of four more days, the stable is to be whitewashed and aired, and it is not to be taken into use again before it is quite dry, or after such a time as is enjoined for each particular disease.

Implements which could not stand this treatment, must be heated to 60° R. (167° Fahrenheit).

Art. VII.—It is the duty of the veterinary surgeon to inform the authorities when he considers the disease to be at an end.

Regulations to be Observed with regard to Pleuro-pneumonia.—(Part of Decree of 28 September 1858.)

When pleuro-pneumonia has broken out in a single farm or premises, which is then put under the supervision of the Government officers, access to the cattle must be forbidden to all persons not concerned, whether strangers or persons belonging to the farm or premises. As a rule, all cattle which the veterinary surgeon declares to be infected, must be killed immediately.

As long as all infected cattle are killed at the cost of the Treasury, no surgical treatment of the infected cattle must be attempted.

The attendants, milkmaids and others that come near the infected cattle, must not be allowed to approach non-infected animals on the farm or elsewhere, without first being fumigated with chlorine gas, or having changed their clothes. The veterinary surgeon himself must observe the same precautions against spreading the contagion.

The infected cattle must be placed in separate stables or enclosures as far distant as possible from the other stock. If any head of cattle is discovered suffering from symptoms which render the presence of the disease probable, it must be separated from the other animals as soon as possible. Particular animals, which may have been specially exposed to the contagion, may also be isolated at once.

The infected animals must have separate attendants and milkmaids, as well as separate pails and stable implements, which must not be used with healthy animals. Their dung should be carried out on the fields immediately, and buried or ploughed down there; in the latter case, not nearer to any neighbouring fields than 50 feet.

The diseased animals must be slaughtered on the farm or premises themselves.

The stalls which have been used by the diseased animals must, immediately after their removal, be cleaned with boiling water and chloride of lime in the manner prescribed in the general orders [vide *supra*]. Weak fumigations with chlorine may be used in the stable.

No cattle, hay, straw, nor dung must be carried away from the premises or farm, which remain closed in this manner, at least three months after the disappearance of the disease.

When any cattle is to be slaughtered, the veterinary surgeon must guard against any opportunity being given for the spreading of the contagion, at the valuation, the slaughter, or the dissection.

Not only the slaughtered animals, but also those that die a natural death, must be dissected by the veterinary surgeon.

The hides of the slaughtered animals must either immediately be thrown in a lime pit on the spot, or must be taken, with due precautions, direct to the tanner, covered with a layer of chloride of lime.

The meat from cattle that, before the slaughter, have been declared by the veterinary surgeon to be suffering from pleuro-pneumonia must not be used as food; but the meat of those animals which, before the slaughter, have been pronounced apparently healthy may be used, even if the dissection should show that they have suffered slightly from the disease, provided that the alterations in the tissue of the lungs are not present in any high degree, or to any great extent, or, generally speaking, that no such diseased condition is observed which would render the use of the meat unadvisable.

All meat that may be used ought, as soon as it has cooled, to be salted into barrels, in the same premises where the slaughter has taken place, which barrels should be kept in some place there, to which strangers have no access.

The tallow must be melted down on the premises.

The interment of the dead and slaughtered animals must be done by persons belonging to the farm or premises, or by people who have no occasion of going near cattle.

The place of interment must be in some out-of-the-way situation, and a layer of chloride of lime must be spread over the body, the whole to be covered with, at least, four feet of earth.

The

The head, feet, and entrails, the blood and other offal from cattle, of which the meat may be used, must be buried in the same manner as the infected animals.

Not more animals must be killed on any one day than can be interred on the same day.

With regard to the dissection and the preservation of the diseased parts in case of doubt, the same rules hold good which are enjoined in cases of glanders.

A stock of cattle amongst which pleuro-pneumonia has appeared, must not be allowed to graze within a distance of 50 feet from any fields belonging to a neighbour, and should therefore be carefully watched whether tethered or not.

As long as the system of slaughtering the cattle is pursued, animals which have recovered from the disease may be considered as infected and may be killed. When the Minister of the Interior has ordered the discontinuance of slaughtering infected cattle, the animals which have recovered had better be fattened and then slaughtered, but in any case they must be kept isolated for at least three months.

Infected or suspected cattle must not be driven on, to, or along any common road.

The roads along which infected cattle have passed, ought to be cleansed from all excrements, and, when such can be done, closed for some time.

Fields on which infected or suspected cattle have been ought to be closed for healthy animals for six weeks.

Fodder which has been exposed to the exhalations of infected cattle must not in any way be used in such a manner as to expose other cattle to the contagion through the use of it. With due care it may be used for other domestic animals. Whatever may not have been utilized in this manner must be destroyed before new cattle are brought into the stock.

Inoculation must not take place without the permission of the proper authority, and an inoculated stock must be treated as infected.

A stable which has been used by infected cattle must be properly cleaned and fumigated with chlorine, and it must be exposed to air for six weeks before being taken into use.

DECREE concerning the Foot-and-Mouth Disease of 10 April 1875.

The measures prescribed by the law of 29 December 1857, Art. 1 to 7, 9, and 12–14, with regard to infectious diseases amongst domestic animals, are in future to apply also to the foot-and-mouth disease, which is hereby brought to public knowledge in accordance with Art. II. of the said law.

REGULATIONS to be observed with regard to the Foot and Mouth Disease, issued 16 October 1875.

Art. I.—The animals affected must be kept indoors. It is not necessary to keep them separate from the other animals on the premises which are under public supervision.

Art. II.—Milk and cream from the diseased animals must not be taken out from the farm except after being boiled.

Art. III.—As long as the public supervision lasts no hay nor straw must be carried away from the farm without the permission of the veterinary police.

Art. IV.—Animals affected with this disease may be taken away from the farm to be killed, but only with the permission, and under the supervision, of the veterinary police.

Art. V.—Especial care must be taken in order that the infection may not spread through the dung or offal from the place where the diseased animals are kept.

Art. VI.—When the disease has ceased on the premises, complete disinfection must be effected. The public supervision may then terminate at the expiration of four weeks after the disappearance of the disease.

Art. VII.—As a rule, it suffices that the stock is examined by the veterinary surgeon, on behalf of the authorities, three times, viz., at the outbreak of the disease, when it is supposed to have ceased, and when the final disinfection has taken place.

Appendix, No. 1.

ORDER concerning Measures against Importation of Cattle Plague from Germany.—(16 January 1877.)

Inasmuch as the cattle plague has appeared in Germany, the Home Office has decided, in virtue of the Infectious Diseases of Domestic Animals Act of 29 December 1857, Art. 9, to order the following measures in order to prevent this disease being brought into the country, viz.:—

Art. I.—Importation into this country from Germany of horned cattle, sheep, goats, or undressed parts of these animals, such as hides or skins, whether dried or salted, horns, hoofs, wool, hair, meat not smoked, tallow not melted, &c., is prohibited. No cattle-truck, foreign or Danish, at this moment being abroad, may be brought across the frontier of Jutland. All other domestic animals than those above-mentioned, on arriving from Germany, must be disinfected before being imported.

Likewise all hay and straw from Germany is to be disinfected before importation, unless it serves as packing, properly speaking, for goods which are not themselves likely to carry infection, being placed in baskets, barrels, or boxes, in which the goods are transported, or tied round the merchandize, in which case the hay or straw may be unloaded and delivered to the importer without previous disinfection, on the condition that the latter, immediately after reception of the goods, causes them to be unpacked, and the packing to be disinfected or burnt under the supervision of the veterinary police.

Art. II.—Vessels arriving here, having on board animals or goods of which the importation is prohibited, or allowed only after previous disinfection, must not unload before the veterinary police, having examined the vessel, has given permission for unloading, together with instructions as to the mode of proceeding, in order to prevent the spread of any infection. The same rule holds good with regard to vessels which have had cattle, sheep, or goats, from any foreign place on board, if any of these animals has died on board or been killed in a state of disease.

Art. III.—Merchandize of vegetable or animal description arriving together with objects of which the importation is prohibited, must be disinfected. The same applies to vessels, carts, and tools which have been used in the transport of objects which are to be disinfected, provided that such disinfection is not to be deemed necessary merely because hay or straw has been used for the packing properly speaking (*vide supra* Art. I.)

Art. IV.—The disinfection enjoined by this order must always be carried our under the supervision, and according to the instructions, of the veterinary police. Goods which are to be disinfected, are to be unloaded, where special localities for disinfection have been provided, close to these; until such localities have been provided, the goods must be subjected to a preliminary process of disinfection in the hold of the vessel itself previous to being unloaded. All expenses connected with the disinfection are to be borne by the owner of the goods.

Art. V.—Transgressions of the provisions of this order are to be punished according to the law of 29 December 1857, Art. XII., with fines from 1 to 100 crowns, which will be doubled in case of repetition of the offence. Damage done by such transgressions will have to be made good according to the general rules of the law.

Art. VI.—The present order takes effect at once.

LAW concerning the Export of Domestic Animals from *Denmark*.—(25 February 1876.)

The Government is authorised to take such measures as may be found necessary, in order to prevent that domestic animals are exported from this country which are or may be suspected to be affected with contagious diseases, and also to prevent that the animals sent to foreign countries from Denmark, are exposed to such diseases on the journey to their destination.

ORDER concerning Measures with regard to Export of Domestic Animals to *Great Britain*.—(26 February 1876).

In pursuance of the authorization granted to the Government by the law of the 25th of this month concerning measures with regard to the exportation of domestic animals from Denmark, the following provisions are hereby ordered in respect of export of domestic animals to Great Britain.

Art. I.—Every head of cattle which is intended for shipment to Great Britain must, before

before it is brought on board, be examined at the expense of the sender, by a veterinary surgeon authorised for the purpose by the local chief of police, and must not be shipped unless it is proved by examination not to exhibit any symptom of any infectious disease; and unless there is no other reason for suspecting it of being infected with any such disease, to which effect a certificate is to be given by the veterinary surgeon.

Art. II.—At the examination of the animals the different droves are to be kept separate in such a manner as to prevent an infectious disease which might possibly exist in one of them, from being transferred to others.

Art. III.—No cattle intended for shipment to Great Britain must be shipped until the veterinary police has given permission for cattle to be brought on board, which permission can be granted only when the vessel has been properly disinfected, in case there are reasons for considering the vessel dangerous in respect of infection.

Art. IV.—Every head of cattle before shipment is to be marked plainly, the mark being either put on in oil paint, or burnt into the horn. The veterinary surgeon is to indicate the mark in the certificate which he issues for the animal, in which also the sex of the animal is to be stated. The shipment has to be executed under the supervision of the veterinary police.

Circular to the Prefects in view of an eventual Importation of the Cattle Plague.—(10 February 1877.)

For the case that the cattle plague which at present exists in Germany and in England should make its way into this country, in spite of the precautionary measures which have been adopted, the Home Office has considered it right already now to avail itself of the power conferred upon it by Art. VIII. of the Law of 29 December 1857, concerning infectious diseases in domestic animals, and to order the immediate slaughter, in its entirety, of any stock of cattle in this country in which the existence of cattle plague may have been ascertained.

In communicating the above, the Home Office at the same time requests you to order the chiefs of police in your district, in case of need, to take the necessary measures for carrying out this injunction, and you are also desired, if any suspicion should arise of the said disease having made its appearance in any stock, immediately to report to the Home Office by telegraph.

The Export of Cattle and Sheep from Denmark, 1866–1876.

Year.	Cattle.			Sheep and Lambs.		
	Great Britain.	Schleswig and Holstein.	Total.	Great Britain.	Schleswig and Holstein.	Total.
1866 - -	8,900	45,900	55,800	8,700	7,200	19,600
1867 - -	6,100	45,000	57,600	2,900	5,300	9,700
1868 - -	4,500	45,900	51,600	2,000	3,700	7,600
1869 - -	6,100	39,000	46,400	4,000	2,800	8,600
1870 - -	8,500	35,400	44,700	5,300	1,800	7,800
1871 - -	13,400	35,600	49,500	9,800	10,600	21,000
1872 - -	19,000	41,900	61,700	14,000	23,600	39,000
1873 - -	26,300	39,700	66,900	20,300	24,600	46,000
1874 - -	26,300	47,300	75,000	13,700	25,000	40,700
1875 - -	50,200	45,400	97,100	55,200	14,500	71,300
1876 - -	57,900	?	?	58,200	?	?

Appendix, No. 2.

PAPER handed in by Professor *Brown*, 17 May 1877.

Appendix, No. 2.

Cattle Plague in Great Britain.

DATE.	Number of Farms or other Places upon which the Disease appeared.	Number of Cattle upon Farms or other Places upon which the Disease appeared.	Healthy Cattle on Infected Premises.		Attacked.	Diseased Cattle	
			Slaughtered to prevent the spread of the Disease.	Escaped the Disease.		Killed.	Died.
1872	23	289	171	46	72	51	21
1877 (up to 4 May)	45	1,084	835	1	248	214	34

Veterinary Department,
Privy Council Office, 16 May 1877.

Memorandum.—Computing the value of the cattle at 20 *l.* a head for those diseased, and all those slaughtered healthy on the infected premises, the loss would be about 5,000 *l.* in 1872, and about 22,000 *l.* in 1877; but against these losses there would be the set-off in the salvage for carcases of cattle slaughtered healthy, which appears in the latter year to have been considerable, say about half the value.

Appendix, No. 3.

PAPERS handed in by Mr. *May*, 6 June 1877.

RETURN of the Number of CATTLE, &c., in the *Netherlands* in 1875. Appendix, No. 3.

PROVINCES.	Cattle.	Sheep.	Goats.	Horses.	Swine.
North Brabant - - - -	178,425	45,092	41,492	31,228	52,370
Guelderland - - - - -	188,596	72,031	46,267	34,677	78,232
South Holland - - - -	217,910	66,981	12,731	39,008	26,854
North Holland - - - -	148,990	244,961	6,567	22,433	25,237
Zeeland - - - - -	59,414	33,647	5,730	24,544	20,681
Utrecht - - - - -	88,021	34,596	7,253	12,110	19,933
Friesland - - - - -	212,774	120,873	1,950	23,202	11,525
Over-Yssel - - - - -	128,482	49,373	10,008	17,402	27,384
Groningen - - - - -	103,008	85,615	3,612	28,853	18,251
Drenthe - - - - -	67,005	128,649	6,025	12,494	21,532
Limburg - - - - -	73,056	59,249	11,447	14,105	36,647
TOTAL - - -	1,456,681	941,067	153,082	260,056	338,646

CASES of PLEURO-PNEUMONIA in the *Netherlands*, 1871–76.

1871 - - - - - - - -	6,078.
1872 - - - - - - - -	4,009.
1873 - - - - - - - -	2,479.
1874 - - - - - - - -	2,414.
1875 - - - - - - - -	2,227.
1876 - - - - - - - -	1,723.

Appendix, No. 4.

PAPERS handed in by Mr. *C. L. Peel*, 13 June 1877.

Appendix, No. 4.

ORDERS OF COUNCIL.

(366.)

At the Council Chamber, Whitehall, the 2nd day of August 1873.

By the Lords of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council.

PRESENT:

Lord President. | Mr. Forster.

The Lords and others of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, by virtue and in exercise of the powers in them vested under The Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869 (in this Order referred to as the Act of 1869), and of every other power enabling them in this behalf, do order, and it is hereby ordered, as follows:—

1. This Order may be cited as the Animals (Amendment) Order of 1873.

2. This Order shall take effect from and immediately after the thirty-first day of August, One thousand eight hundred and seventy-three; and words in this Order have the same meaning as in the Act of 1869.

Pleuro-pneumonia.

3. Every Local Authority shall cause all cattle affected with pleuro-pneumonia within their district to be slaughtered.

The provisions numbered (1), (2), and (3) of Article 31, and Articles 32, 33, and 34, relating to compensation, of the Animals Order of 1871, shall have effect in case of slaughter under this Article of this Order.

Foot-and-Mouth Disease.

4. Foot-and-mouth disease shall not be deemed to be a contagious or infectious disease within either of the following Articles of the Animals Order of 1871, namely, Articles 19 and 27.

Any regulations made by a Local Authority under the said Article 27 as far as they relate to foot-and-mouth disease are hereby revoked.

5. Where an animal becomes affected with foot-and-mouth disease while exposed or placed or being carried, led, or driven, as in Section 57 of the Act of 1869 mentioned, it may, notwithstanding anything in that section, be, with a license of an Inspector of the Local Authority authorised to issue the same, but not otherwise, moved for purposes of feeding, or watering, or other ordinary purposes connected with the breeding or rearing of animals, to any land or building in the occupation of the owner of the animal, or for slaughter to the nearest slaughter-house or some other slaughter-house approved by the Local Authority.

The form given in the Second Schedule to this Order, or a form to the like effect, with such variations as circumstances require, shall be used.

Revocation.

6. The Orders and part of an Order of Council described in the First Schedule to this Order, and any regulations made by a Local Authority under that part of an Order, are hereby revoked: Provided that nothing in this Order shall invalidate or make unlawful anything done under the said Orders and part of an Order and regulations, or interfere with the institution or prosecution of any proceeding in respect of any offence committed against or any penalty or forfeiture incurred under the same.

(signed) *Arthur Helps.*

FIRST SCHEDULE.

Orders and Part of Order Revoked.

Date.	Subject or Short Title.
1871.	
20 December -	Article 28—Foot-and-Mouth Disease—of the Animals Order of 1871.
1872.	
20 June - -	Foot-and-Mouth Disease—Stanley Market, Liverpool.
5 November -	Pleuro-pneumonia—Power for Local Authority to slaughter in case of contact.
12 December -	Foot-and-Mouth Disease—Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

SECOND SCHEDULE.

Form of License.

*No.

Dated this of 18 .

Name and address of owner, or his or her agent -

Number of animals

Description of ditto

Route

From

Through

To

Purposes

[To be signed]

* This number must correspond with that on the license.

This counterfoil is to be retained by the person granting the license.

Caution.—Persons fabricating or altering or committing other offences with respect to licenses are liable, under The Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869, to fine or imprisonment.

FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE.

Movement License.

* No.

I, *A.B.*, of , being an Inspector authorised by the Local Authority of the of to issue licenses under Article 5 of The Animals (Amendment) Order of 1873, for the movement of animals becoming affected with foot-and-mouth disease while exposed or placed or being carried, led, or driven, as mentioned in Section 57 of The Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869, hereby license the person undermentioned, being the owner of the undermentioned animals, or his [*or* her] agent, to move the said animals from to by the undermentioned route for the undermentioned purposes:

Number and Description of Animals.	Name and Address of Owner, or his or her Agent.	Route to be taken.	Purposes for which Movement is Licensed.	Remarks.
		From Through To		

The time allowed for removals under this license is two days, from and after to-day.

[To be signed] _____

Inspector.

Dated this day of 18 .

* This number must correspond with that on the counterfoil.

Caution.—Persons fabricating or altering or committing other offences with respect to licenses are liable, under The Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869, to fine or imprisonment.

Appendix, No. 4.

70. All the regulations of the Fourth Schedule to the Act of 1869 shall apply to cattle brought from any of the countries comprised in the following

SCHEDULE

The Austrian-Hungarian Empire.
*Belgium.
France.
*The German Empire (subject to Chapter 18.—*Cattle from Schleswig and Holstein*).
The dominions of the King of the Hellenes.
The Netherlands.
The dominions of the King of Italy.
The dominions of the Sultan.

71. Cattle brought from any of the countries scheduled in Article 70 shall not be landed except at a landing-place within the respective defined parts of the following ports:

Goole.	Middlesbrough.
Grimsby.	Plymouth.
Hartlepool.	Southampton.
Hull.	Sunderland.
London.	

62. A defined part of a port for cattle shall be deemed a defined part of the same port for animals.

63. Foreign animals shall not be landed at any place except the ports following:

Falmouth.	London.
Glasgow.	Middlesbrough.
Goole.	Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
Granton.	Plymouth.
Grimsby.	Portsmouth.
Hartlepool.	Rochester.
Harwich.	Shields, South.
Hull.	Southampton.
Kirkwall.	Sunderland.
Leith.	Weymouth.
Liverpool.	

(368.)

At the Council Chamber, Whitehall, the 13th day of November 1873.

By the Lords of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council.

THE Lords of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, by virtue and in exercise of the powers in them vested under The Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869, and of every other power enabling them in this behalf, do hereby revoke their Order, bearing date the tenth day of August, One thousand eight hundred and sixty-nine, defining the part of the port of Liverpool, in the County of Lancaster, within which foreign cattle might be landed for slaughter: Provided that nothing herein shall be deemed to invalidate or make unlawfu anything done under the said Order before the date of this revocation, or interfere with the institution or prosecution of any proceeding in respect of any offence committed against, or any penalty incurred under, the said Order.

(signed) *Edmund Harrison.*

(369.)

At the Council Chamber, Whitehall, the 13th day of November 1873.

By the Lords of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council.

THE Lords of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, by virtue and in exercise of the powers in them vested under The Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869, and of every other power enabling them in this behalf, do hereby revoke their Order, bearing date the

---

*Cattle are *prohibited*. { Sheep and goats scheduled from Netherlands. Belgium, France,

the twenty-seventh day of October, One thousand eight hundred and seventy, defining the parts of the Port of Shoreham, in the county of Sussex, within which foreign cattle might be landed for slaughter: Provided that nothing herein shall be deemed to invalidate or make unlawful anything done under the said Order before the date of this revocation, or interfere with the institution or prosecution of any proceeding in respect of any offence committed against, or any penalty incurred under, the said Order.

(signed) *Edmund Harrison.*

(370.)

At the Council Chamber, Whitehall, the 27th day of February 1874.

By the Lords of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council.

PRESENT:

Lord President. | Mr. Secretary Cross.

THE Lords and others of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, by virtue and in exercise of the powers in them vested under The Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869, and of every other power enabling them in this behalf, do Order, and it is hereby Ordered, as follows:—

1. This Order shall take effect from and immediately after the twenty-seventh day of February, One thousand eight hundred and seventy-four, and shall cease to have effect from and immediately after the thirtieth day of November, One thousand eight hundred and seventy-four.

2. This Order may be cited as the Schleswig-Holstein Order of 1874.

3. This Order extends to Great Britain only.

4. In this Order—

The Act of 1869 means The Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869:

A defined part of a port means a part of a port defind by a special Order of the Privy Council in pursuance of Regulation 2 of the Fourth Schedule to the Act of 1869:

Landing-place for slaughter means a landing-place within a defined part of a port.
Master includes any person having the charge or command of a vessel.
Other terms have the same meaning as in the Act of 1869.

5. Notwithstanding anything in the Foreign Animals Order of 1871, the regulations in the Fourth Schedule to the Act of 1869 shall not apply to cattle brought from a port in either of the parts of the German Empire, respectively known as Schleswig and Holstein.

6. Cattle brought from a port of Schleswig or of Holstein shall not be landed elsewhere than at a landing-place for slaughter, unless and until the owner, agent, or charterer of the vessel in which they are brought has received the special permission of the Privy Council to employ the vessel in the trade of importation of cattle from ports of Schleswig and of Holstein or of either of them under this Order.

7. The landing of cattle brought from a port of Schleswig or of Holstein, elsewhere than at a landing-place for slaughter, shall be subject to the following conditions:—

First. That the vessel in which they are imported has not, within three months before taking them on board, had on board any cattle exported or carried coastwise from any port in any part of the German Empire, other than Schleswig or Holstein, or from any port of any of the following countries, namely:—

The Dominions of the Emperor of Russia.
The Austrian-Hungarian Empire.
The Dominions of the Sultan.
The Dominions of the King of Italy.
The Dominions of the King of the Hellenes.
Belgium.
France.

Secondly. That the vessel has not, since taking on board the cattle imported, entered any such port as aforesaid.

Thirdly. That the cattle imported have not, while on board the vessel, been in contact with any cattle exported or carried coastwise from any such port as aforesaid.

Fourthly. That the cattle imported are accompanied by a declaration and certificates, such as are indicated in the forms set forth in the schedule to this Order, or to the like effect.

Appendix, No. 4.

8. Further, cattle brought from a port of Schleswig or of Holstein shall not be landed elsewhere than at a landing-place for slaughter, unless and until—

(1.) The owner or charterer of the vessel in which they are imported, or his agent in Great Britain, has entered into a bond to Her Majesry the Queen, in a sum not exceeding one thousand pounds, with or without a surety or sureties, to the satisfaction of the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Customs, conditioned for the observance of the foregoing conditions in relation to cattle to be landed under this Order from the vessel; and

(2.) The master of the vessel has on each occasion of importation of cattle therein, satisfied the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Customs, or their proper officer, by declaration made and signed, or otherwise, that none of the cattle then imported therein have been exported from any port in any part of the German Empire, other than Schleswig or Holstein, or from any port of any of the other countries named in Article 7 of this Order, and that the foregoing conditions have been observed in relation to all the cattle then imported therein.

9. If the Veterinary Inspector of the Privy Council is of opinion, on the examination of any cattle imported under this Order, that the declaration accompanying the cattle is untrue in any particular, as regards any one of the cattle in the vessel, then all the animals in the vessel shall be detained and dealt with in accordance with instructions from time to time given by the Privy Council.

10. If the declaration accompanying any cattle imported under this Order is untrue in any particular, as regards any one of the cattle to which it relates, the master of the vessel shall be guilty of an offence against this Order, unless he shows to the satisfaction of the justices before whom he is charged, that he did not know of the same being so untrue, and that he could not with reasonable diligence have obtained such knowledge.

11. Subject to the provisions of this Order all the provisions of the Foreign Animals Order of 1871 shall continue to apply to cattle brought from a port of Schleswig or of Holstein.

(signed) *Arthur Helps.*

SCHEDULE.

Declaration and Certificates.

DECLARATION.

I, *A. B.*, of , being the agent for the owners [*or* charterers] of the vessel , of , hereby solemnly and sincerely declare to the best of my knowledge and belief, that each of the cattle described below, now about to be put on board the said vessel, has been bred and fed exclusively in Denmark, Schleswig, and Holstein, or some or one of them, and has never been in contact with cattle not so exclusively bred and fed, and has not within the last three months been carried at sea on any vessel.

Dated this day of

[To be signed] *A.B.*

Description of Cattle above referred to.

	Number*
Bulls	
Oxen	
Cows	
Calves	

*Number to be expressed both in words and in figures.

CERTIFICATE BY CONSULAR OFFICER.

I, *C.D.*, Vice consul [*or as the case may be*] of Her Britannic Majesty at the Port of Husum [*or as the case may be*], hereby certify that the foregoing declaration was made by the above named *A.B.* before me, this day of 1874, and that I know the said *A.B.*, and that he is worthy of belief.

[To be signed] *C.D.*

[and Consular Seal to be affixed.]

CERTIFICATE BY OFFICER OF ROYAL PRUSSIAN PROVINCIAL COUNCIL OFFICE.

I, *X.Y.*, hereby certify that I have this day seen the cattle above described, and that I believe the statements respecting the breeding, feeding, and carrying of each of them contained in the foregoing declaration of *A.B.* to be true in all respects.

[To be signed] *X.Y.*,

Officer of Royal Prussian Provincial Council Office, at the Port of Husum [*or as the case may be.*]

(371.)

At the Council Chamber, Whitehall, the 3rd day of June 1874.

By the Lords of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council.

PRESENT:

Lord President. | Lord Sandon.

THE Lords and others of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, by virtue and in exercise of the powers in them vested under The Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869 (in this Order referred to as the Act of 1869), and of every other power enabling them in this behalf, do order, and it is hereby ordered, as follows:—

1. This Order may be cited as the Foot-and-Mouth Disease Order of 1874.

2. Words in this Order have the same meaning as in the Act of 1869.

3. Articles 19, 27, and 28 of the Animals Order of 1871, shall have effect as if the Animals (Amendment) Order of 1873 had not been made.

4. Nothing in this Order shall revive any Regulation made by a Local Authority which was revoked by the Animals (Amendment) Order of 1873.

5. Article 28 of the Animals Order of 1871 shall extend to authorise a Local Authority to make regulations for prohibiting or regulating the movement, as therein provided, of any animal affected with foot-and-mouth disease; but nothing in this Order, or in any regulation of a Local Authority thereunder, shall be deemed to authorise the movement of any animal in contravention of Section 57, or of any other provision of the Act of 1869.

6. Article 5 of the Animals (Amendment) Order of 1873 is hereby revoked.

Where an animal becomes affected with foot-and-mouth disease, while exposed or placed, or being carried, led, or driven, as in Section 57 of the Act of 1869 mentioned, it may, notwithstanding anything in that Section, be, with a license of an Inspector of the Local Authority authorised to issue the same, but not otherwise, moved for purposes of feeding, or watering, or other ordinary purposes connected with the breeding or rearing of animals, to any land or building in the occupation of the owner of the animal, or for slaughter to the nearest slaughter-house, or some other slaughter-house approved by the Local Authority.

The form given in the Schedule to this Order, or a form to the like effect, with such variations as circumstances require, shall be used.

(signed) *Arthur Helps.*

SCHEDULE.

Form of License.

* No.

Dated this of 18 .

Name and address of owner, or his or her agent

Number of animals

Description of ditto

Route

From

Through

To

Purposes

[To be signed]

* This number must correspond with that on the license.

This counterfoil is to be retained by the person granting the license.

Caution.—Persons fabricating or altering or committing other offences with respect to licenses are liable, under The Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869, to fine or imprisonment.

FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE.

Movement License.

* No.

I, *A.B.*, of , being an Inspector authorised by the Local Authority of the of to issue licenses under Article of the Foot-and-Mouth Disease Order of 1874, for the movement of animals becoming affected with foot-and-mouth disease while exposed or placed or being carried, led, or driven, as mentioned in Section 57 of The Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869, hereby license the person undermentioned, being the owner of the undermentioned animals, or his [*or* her] agent, to move the said animals from to by the undermentioned route for the undermentioned purposes:

Number and Description of Animals.	Name and Address of Owner, or his or her Agent.	Route to be taken.	Purposes for which Movement is Licensed.	Remarks.
		From Through To		

The time allowed for removals under this license is two days, from and after to-day.

[To be signed]

Inspector.

Dated this day of 18 .

* This number must correspond with that on the counterfoil.

Caution.—Persons fabricating or altering or committing other offences with respect to licenses are liable, under The Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869, to fine or imprisonment.

Appendix, No. 4.

(372.)

At the Council Chamber, Whitehall, the 7th day of August 1874.

By the Lords of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council.

PRESENT:

Lord President. | Lord Sandon.

THE Lords and others of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, by virtue and in exercise of the powers in them vested under The Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869, and of every other power enabling them in this behalf, do declare and order, and it is hereby declared and ordered, as follows:—

1. This Order may be cited as the Animals (Amendment) Order of 1874.

2. In this Order the Act of 1869 means The Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869; and words in this Order have the same meaning as in that Act.

3. The Foreign Animals Order of 1871 has and shall have effect subject and by way of supplement to the Animals Order of 1871; and nothing in the Foreign Animals Order of 1871 interferes or shall interfere with the execution or discharge by the Local Authority, or the Inspector or other officer of the Local Authority, of any power or duty conferred or imposed on them or him by the Act of 1869, or by any Order of Council.

4. Regulation Seven of the Fourth Schedule to the Act of 1869 shall apply in every case where a vessel comes into port having on board foreign animals maimed or injured on the voyage; but, notwithstanding anything in Section Nineteen of the Act of 1869, any animals being at any time within any such port shall not be deemed foreign animals, by reason only of anything in this Order.

5. The Order of Council on the 30th day of June 1873, relating to glanders and farcy shall have effect as if in Article Two thereof the word glanders were substituted for the words contagious or infectious disease.

(signed) *Arthur Helps.*

(373.)

At the Council Chamber, Whitehall, the 5th day of June 1875.

By the Lords of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council

PRESENT:

Lord President. | Lord Sandon.

Mr. Secretary Cross.

THE Lords and others of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, by virtue and in exercise of the powers in them vested under The Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869, and of every other power enabling them in this behalf, do order, and it is hereby ordered, as follows:—

1. The Orders of Council described in the Schedule to this Order are hereby revoked; but this revocation shall not—

(*a*) revive any Order revoked by or otherwise affect the past operation of any of those Orders;

(*b*) affect the validity or invalidity of anything done or suffered, or any appointment made, or any license or authority granted, or any right, title, obligation, or liability accrued thereunder, before this Order takes effect; or

(*c*) interfere with the institution or prosecution of any proceeding in respect of any offence committed against or any penalty or forfeiture incurred under any Order hereby revoked.

2. All orders and regulations made by a Local Authority under any former Order of Council, in force at the commencement of this Order, shall, as far as the same are not varied by or inconsistent with the Animals Order of 1875, remain in force until altered or revoked by a Local Authority.

3. This Order shall take effect from and immediately after the twenty-third day of June, One thousand eight hundred and seventy-five.

(signed) *C. L. Peel.*

SCHEDULE.

Orders of Council Revoked.

Date.	Subject or Short Title.
1869.	
10 August - -	Bristol—Limits of Port.
10 August - -	Portsmouth—Limits of Port.
10 August - -	Dartmouth—Limits of Port.
10 August - -	Liverpool—Limits of Port.
28 September -	Portsmouth—Amendment.
1870.	
1 October -	Southampton—Limits of Port.
27 October -	Shoreham—Limits of Port.
1871.	
31 March - -	The Transit of Animals (Water) Order of March 1871.
8 December -	Belgium and France—Importation.
20 December -	The Animals Order of 1871.
20 December -	The Foreign Animals Order of 1871.
20 December -	Revocation of Orders.
29 December -	London—Foreign Cattle Market—Approval.
1872.	
20 June - -	Foot-and-Mouth Disease—Stanley Market, Liverpool.
4 July - -	The Schleswig and Holstein Cattle Order of 1872.
11 July - -	The Carcases of Animals Order of 1872.
15 July - -	Belgium—Importation.
19 July - -	Russia—Importation.
31 July - -	The Schleswig and Holstein Cattle Order of 1872—Revocation.
31 July - -	Germany—Importation.
6 August - -	France—Importation.
8 August - -	The Markets Order of 1872.
8 August - -	London—Part of Foreign Cattle Market declared free.
20 August - -	Belgium and France—Revocation.
7 September -	The Cattle Plague Order of 1872.
17 September -	The Cattle Plague Order of 1872—Amendment.
5 November -	Pleuro-Pneumonia.
5 November -	Barrow-in-Furness—Importation.
12 December -	Foot-and-Mouth Disease—Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
1873.	
7 January - -	Germany—Revocation.
11 June - -	The Schleswig-Holstein Order of 1873.
30 June - - -	Glanders and Farcy.
2 August - -	The Animals (Amendment) Order of 1873.
25 September -	Southampton—Amendment.
13 November -	Liverpool—Revocation.
13 November -	Shoreham—Revocation.
1874.	
27 February -	The Schleswig-Holstein Order of 1874.
3 June - -	The Foot-and-Mouth Disease Order of 1874.
7 August - -	The Animals (Amendment) Order of 1874.

Appendix, No. 4.

THE ANIMALS ORDER OF 1875.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Page

Preliminary - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 521

Part I.—Contagious or Infectious Disease among Animals.

Chapter 1.—Discovery and Prevention of Disease - - - - - - - - - - - 522
Chapter 2.—Cleansing and Disinfection - - - - - - - - - - - - - 523
Chapter 3.—Carcases - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 524
Chapter 4.—Pleuro-Pneumonia - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 525
Chapter 5.—Foot-and-Mouth Disease - - - - - - - - - - - - - 526
Chapter 6.—Sheep-Scab - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 526
Chapter 7.—Glanders - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 526
Chapter 8.—Farcy - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 527

Part II.—Transit of Animals.

Chapter 9.—Transit by Sea - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 527
Chapter 10.—Shipping and Unshipping Places - - - - - - - - - - - 527
Chapter 11.—Transit by Railway - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 527
Chapter 12.—Offences - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 528
Chapter 13.—Water Supply on Railways - - - - - - - - - - - - 528

Part III.—Foreign Animals.

Chapter 14.—Foreign Animals Generally - - - - - - - - - - - - - 528
Chapter 15.—Cattle from Austria-Hungary, Belgium, France, Germany (subject to Chapter 18.—Cattle from Schleswig and Holstein), Greece, Italy, and Turkey - - - - 529
Chapter 16.—Animals in Defined Parts of Ports - - - - - - - - - - - 530
Chapter 17.—Animals landed out of Defined Parts of Ports - - - - - - - - - 530
Chapter 18.—Cattle from Schleswig and Holstein - - - - - - - - - - - 531
Chapter 19.—Animals and Articles from Russia - - - - - - - - - - - 531
Chapter 20.—Milch Cows and Surplus Ships' Stores - - - - - - - - - - 532

Part IV.—General Provisions.

Chapter 21.—Local Authorities - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 532
Chapter 22.—General Offences - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 532
Schedules - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 533

THE ANIMALS ORDER OF 1875.

(374.)

At the Council Chamber, Whitehall, the 5th day of June 1875.

By the Lords of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council.

PRESENT:

Lord President. | Lord Sandon.

Mr. Secretary Cross.

WHEREAS by an Order of the Privy Council of the same date as this Order all former Orders of Council in force relative to contagious or infectious disease among animals in Great Britain (except Orders relating to particular ports), have been revoked as from and immediately after the twenty-third day of June, One thousand eight hundred and seventy-five:

And whereas it is expedient to renew such of the provisions of those former Orders as are intended to remain in operation, and to make some further provisions for better preventing the introduction or spreading of contagious or infectious disease among animals in Great Britain:

Now, therefore, the Lords and others of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, by virtue and in exercise of the powers in them vested under the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869, and of every other power enabling them in this behalf, do order, and it is hereby ordered, as follows:

Preliminary.

1. This Order shall take effect from and immediately after the twenty-third day of June, One thousand eight hundred and seventy-five.

2. This Order may be cited as the Animals Order of 1875, and is divided into Parts as follows:

PART I.—CONTAGIOUS OR INFECTIOUS DISEASE AMONG ANIMALS.
PART II.—TRANSIT OF ANIMALS.
PART III.—FOREIGN ANIMALS.
PART IV.—GENERAL PROVISIONS.

3. This Order extends to Great Britain only.

4. In this Order—

The Act of 1869 means The Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869:

An Inspector of the Privy Council means a person for the time being appointed by the Privy Council an Inspector for the purposes of the Act of 1869, and includes a Veterinary or other Inspector appointed by the Privy Council for any of those purposes:

Customs means Her Majesty's Customs:

Cattle means bulls, cows, oxen, heifers, and calves:

Animal means, unless it is otherwise expressed, cattle, sheep, goats, and swine:

Foreign, as applied to cattle or animals, means brought from any place out of the United Kingdom:

Cattle-plague means the rinderpest, or disease commonly called the cattle-plague:

Contagious or infectious disease includes cattle-plague, pleuro-pneumonia, foot-and-mouth disease, sheep-pox, sheep-scab, glanders, and farcy:

Person includes a body corporate or unincorporate:

Railway company includes a company or person working a railway under lease or otherwise:

A defined part of a port means a part of a port defined by a special Order of the Privy Council in pursuance of Regulation 2 of the Fourth Schedule to the Act of 1869:

Master includes a person having the charge or command of a vessel:

Loading-pen means a stationary pen or other inclosed space being in or about a station, building, or land of a railway company, and used or intended for the reception or keeping of animals before, after, or in course of their transit by railway:

Truck means a vehicle (not being a horse-box) used or intended for carrying animals (including horses) on a railway:

Van means a vehicle (not being a horse-box) used or intended for carrying for hire animals (including horses) on land otherwise than on a railway:

Other terms, unless it is otherwise expressed, have the same meaning as in the Act of 1869:

Appendix, No. 4.

PART I.

Contagious or Infectious Disease among Animals.

Chapter 1.—*Discovery and Prevention of Disease.*

5. Every person having in his possession or under his charge an animal (including a horse) affected with a contagious or infectious disease shall observe the following rules:

(1.) He shall, as far as practicable, keep that animal separate from animals not so affected.

(2.) He shall with all practicable speed give notice of the fact of the animal being so affected to a constable of the police establishment for the place where the animal is.

The constable shall forthwith give notice thereof to the Inspector of the Local Authority.

The Inspector shall forthwith report the same to the Local Authority and (except in the case of foot-and-mouth disease) to the Privy Council.

6. Where an Inspector of a Local Authority finds in his district cattle-plague, pleuro-pneumonia, sheep-pox, sheep-scab, glanders, or farcy, he shall forthwith make a return thereof to the Local Authority and to the Privy Council, on a form provided by the Privy Council, with all particulars therein required, and shall continue to so make a return thereof on the Saturday of every week until the disease has ceased.

7. Any dung, and any hay, straw, litter, or other thing commonly used for food of animals or otherwise for or about animals, may be moved out of an infected place in the Metropolis (but not out of the Metropolis) with a license signed by an officer of the Local Authority appointed in that behalf certifying that the thing moved has been disinfected, but not otherwise.

8. An officer of a Local Authority authorised in this behalf, or a constable or police officer, may stop and detain an animal (including a horse) which is being moved, or which he has reasonable grounds for suspecting is being moved, in contravention of the Act of 1869 or any Order of Council, and may apprehend, without warrant, the person having charge thereof, and bring him before a Justice.

The Justice shall inquire into the case in a summary manner, and may, if satisfied that there are good grounds for so suspecting, by writing under his hand direct the animal to be detained, and the person having charge thereof to be brought before two Justices as soon as practicable.

On the person being brought before two Justices they shall adjudicate on the case in a summary manner, and if satisfied that the animal was being moved in contravention as aforesaid, may direct it to be disposed of in conformity with the provisions of the Act of 1869 or any Order of Council.

9. An officer of a Local Authority authorised in this behalf, or a constable or a police officer, may inspect a vehicle being a truck, horse-box, or van, within this Order, or a vessel used or intended for carrying animals (including horses) for hire, by sea, or on a canal, navigation, or river, or a vehicle or vessel used or intended for carrying hay, manure, litter, straw, or other article commonly used for food of animals, or otherwise for or about animals, and may examine the person having charge thereof, with a view to ascertain whether any animals or articles are being moved or carried in contravention of the Act of 1869 or any Order of Council; and may, if he has reasonable grounds for suspecting that any animals or articles are being moved or carried in contravention as aforesaid, apprehend, without warrant, the person having charge thereof, and bring him before a Justice.

The Justice shall inquire into the case in a summary manner, and may, if satisfied that there are good grounds for so suspecting, by writing under his hand direct the animals or articles to be detained, and the person having charge thereof to be brought before two Justices as soon as practicable.

On the person being brought before two Justices they shall adjudicate on the case in a summary manner, and if satisfied that the animals or articles were being moved or carried in contravention as aforesaid, may direct them to be destroyed or otherwise disposed of in conformity with the provisions of the Act of 1869 or any Order of Council.

10. A person having charge of an animal (including a horse) or thing that is being moved, for the moving whereof a license is requisite, shall, on being so required by an officer of a Local Authority authorised in this behalf, or by a constable or police officer, produce the license (if any) for the moving of that animal or thing.

11. An officer or constable detaining an animal (including a horse) under the Act of 1869 or any Order of Council, shall cause it to be supplied with requisite food and water during its detention; and the expenses incurred by him in respect thereof may be recovered from the person having charge of the animal or from its owner.

12. An Inspector or other officer empowered to carry the Act of 1869 or any Order of Council into effect may, if authorised in this behalf by general or special order in writing of

of the Privy Council or Local Authority, enter, for the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of the Act or Order, any field, stable, shed, or other premises within his district, where he has reasonable grounds for supposing that an animal affected with cattle-plague, pleuro-pneumonia, or sheep-pox has been, or that the carcase of such an animal has been buried or otherwise disposed of.

If any person refuses admission to, or obstructs or impedes, or aids in obstructing or impeding, the Inspector or other officer, he shall be deemed guilty of an offence against this Order.

13. A Local Authority may, from time to time, with the view of preventing the spreading of contagious or infectious disease, make regulations for the following purposes, or any of them:

For prohibiting or regulating the movement of animals (including horses) on, to, from, and through, and the keeping thereof on, commons and wastes and commonable and other lands whereon there exists a right of common or other right in the nature thereof.

For preventing any person from driving animals (including horses) under his charge, or allowing them to be driven or to stray, into an inclosed field or place without the consent of the occupier thereof.

For preventing the spreading, by means of dogs, of contagious or infectious disease.

For prohibiting or regulating the removal of hay, straw, litter, or other thing commonly used for food of animals, or otherwise for or about animals, that has been in the same field, stable, shed, or other premises with an animal affected with a contagious or infectious disease, or any dung that has been therein.

For providing for the cleansing and disinfection of places used by animals affected with a contagious or infectious disease.

Chapter 2.—*Cleansing and Disinfection.*

14. Every vessel used for carrying animals for hire, by sea, or on a canal, navigation, or river, shall, after the close of each voyage, and before the taking on board of any fresh animals or other cargo, be cleansed and disinfected in the mode following:

(1.) By the sweeping of the hold and every other part of the vessel used for animals, and the effectual removal therefrom of all dung and litter, and of all ashes, sand, sawdust, and other matter with which animals or their droppings have come in contact:

(2.) Then by the thorough washing of the same parts of the vessel with water:

(3.) Then by the application to the sides, floor, and ceiling of the hold, and to every other part of the vessel used for animals (except those parts ordinarily used for passengers), of a coating of limewash made of good freshly burnt lime and water, and containing in each gallon of limewash either one-fifth of a pint of commercial carbolic acid, or one-fifth of a pint of commercial cresylic acid, or four ounces of fresh dry chloride of lime, the limewash being prepared immediately before use: and

(4.) By the application to every part of the vessel which is ordinarily used for passengers, and with which animals or their droppings have come in contact, of limewash or of water, containing in each gallon of limewash or of water one-fifth of a pint of commercial carbolic acid, or one-fifth of a pint of commercial cresylic acid, or four ounces of fresh dry chloride of lime.

The sweepings of the vessel shall be well mixed with quicklime, or be treated in such other manner as the Privy Council direct or approve, and be effectually removed from contact with animals.

15. Every vessel used for carrying horses for hire, by sea, or on a canal, navigation, or river, shall be cleansed and disinfected in such manner and at such times as the Privy Council from time to time direct or approve.

16. Every loading-pen shall be cleansed and disinfected, either on each day on which it is used and after the using thereof, or at some time not later than twelve o'clock at noon of the next following day, unless the following day is Sunday, and then of the Monday following, and before the using thereof.

17. Every truck and every van shall, on every occasion after an animal is taken out of the same, and before any other animal is placed therein, be cleansed and disinfected.

18. A loading pen, truck, and van shall be cleansed and disinfected in the mode following:

(1.) By the sweeping thereof, and the effectual removal therefrom of all dung, sawdust, litter, and other matter:

(2.) Then by the thorough washing thereof with water:

(3.) Then by the application to the surface or floor thereof, and to all parts thereof above the surface or floor with which animals or their droppings have come in contact, of a coating of limewash made of good freshly burnt lime and water, and containing in each gallon of limewash either one-fifth of a pint of commercial carbolic acid, or one-fifth of a pint of commercial cresylic acid, or four ounces of fresh dry chloride of lime, the limewash being prepared immediately before use.

Appendix, No. 4.

The sweepings of the loading-pen, truck, or van shall be well mixed with quicklime, or be treated in such other manner as the Privy Council direct or approve, and be effectually removed from contact with animals.

19. Every horse-box used for carrying horses or animals on a railway or otherwise on land for hire, and every moveable gangway or passage-way, cage, or other apparatus, used or intended for the loading or unloading of animals on or from a truck or vessel, or otherwise used in connection with the transit of animals, shall be cleased and disinfected in such manner and at such times as the Privy Council from time to time direct or approve.

20. Where an animal at a place of landing or place adjacent thereto is affected with a contagious or infectious disease, that place and every other place where the animal is or has been shall not be used for any animals other than animals brought thereto with that animal (in the same vessel or otherwise) unless and until the place has been cleansed and disinfected.

21. Where a Local Authority exercise the power of causing a place to be cleansed and disinfected, conferred on them by Section 61 of the Act of 1869 or by any Order of Council, the occupier thereof shall give all facilities for that purpose.

22. If anything is done or omitted to be done in contravention of any of the foregoing provisions of this chapter, the owner and the master of the vessel in which, and the railway company carrying animals on or owning or working the railway on which, and the owner of the horse-box in respect of which, and the owner and the occupier of the place of landing or place adjacent thereto or other place in which, and the occupier of any other place in respect of which (as the case may be), the same is done or omitted, shall each be deemed guilty of an offence against this Order.

23. A Local Authority may, from time to time, with the view of preventing the spreading of contagious or infectious disease among animals, make regulations for the following purposes, or any of them:

For requiring the owners, lessees, or occupiers of places used for the holding of markets, fairs, exhibitions, or sales of animals, or for the lairage of animals, to cleanse those places from time to time at their own expense:

For requiring the owners, lessees, or occupiers of those places to disinfect the same or any specified part therof, from time to time, at their own expense, where, in the judgment of the Local Authority, the circumstances are such as to allow of such disinfection being reasonably required:

For prescribing the mode in which such cleansing and such disinfection are to be effected.

If the owner, lessee, or occupier of any such place does any act in contravention of the regulations of a Local Authority under this Article, or fails in any respect to observe the same, it shall not be lawful for him or any other person at any time thereafter, until further Order of the Privy Council, to hold a market, fair, exhibition, or sale of animals in that place, and the holding therein of any market, fair, exhibition, or sale of animals shall be and the same is hereby prohibited accordingly.

If any person holds a market, fair, exhibition, or sale of animals in contravention of this Article, he shall be deemed guilty of an offence against this Order.

24. Where the cleansing and disinfection of a place are directed by the Act of 1869, or any Order of Council, or are ordered by a Local Authority, and the mode of the cleansing and disinfection thereof is not described, the same shall be cleansed and disinfected in the mode following:

(1.) By the sweeping thereof, and the effectual removal therefrom of all dung, sawdust, litter, and other matter:

(2.) Then by the thorough washing thereof with water:

(3.) Then by the application to the surface or floor and to all parts above the surface or floor with which animals or their droppings have come in contact, of a coating of limewash made of good freshly burnt lime and water, and containing in each gallon of limewash either one-fifth of a pint of commercial carbolic acid, or one-fifth of a pint of commercial cresylic acid, or four ounces of fresh dry chloride of lime, the limewash being prepared immediately before use.

The sweeping of the place shall be well mixed with quicklime, or be treated in such other manner as the Privy Council direct or approve, and be effectually removed from contact with animals.

Chapter 3.—*Carcases.*

25. Where, under Section 60 of the Act 1869, a Local Authority cause a horse or animal to be buried, they shall cause its skin to be first so slashed as to make it useless.

The Local Authority may, if they think fit, use for the purpose of such burial any place on the premises of the owner of the horse or animal.

26. A Local

26. A Local Authority authorised by license from the Privy Council to destroy, under Section 60 of the Act of 1869, horses or animals that have died or been slaughtered as therein mentioned, shall cause the carcase of every such horse or animal to be destroyed in the mode following:

The carcase thereof shall be disinfected, and shall then be removed, in charge of an officer of the Local Authority, to a horse-slaughterer's or knacker's yard approved for the purpose by the Privy Council, or other place so approved, and shall be there destroyed by exposure to a high temperature, or by chemical agents.

In every such case the Local Authority shall report to the Privy Council the fact and mode of destruction.

27. A Local Authority may, from time to time, with the view of preventing the spreading of contagious or infectious disease, make regulations, in relation to carcases being within their district of animals (including horses) which have died of a contagious or infectious disease, for the following purposes, or either of them:

For prohibiting or regulating the removal of any such carcase:

For securing the burial of any such carcase as soon as possible in its skin in some proper place, the carcase being covered with a sufficient quantity of quicklime or other disinfectant, and with not less than six feet of earth, and the skin being first so slashed as to be useless:

and, where they are authorised in this behalf by license from the Privy Council, but not otherwise, for the following purpose:

For securing the disinfection of any such carcase, and the removal thereof in charge of an officer of the Local Authority to a horse-slaughferer's or knacker's yard approved for the purpose by the Privy Council or other place so approved, and the destruction of the carcase there by exposure to a high temperature, or by chemical agents.

In every such last-mentioned case the Local Authority shall report to the Privy Council the fact and mode of destruction.

28. If any person throws or places, or causes or suffers to be thrown or placed, into or in any river, stream, canal, navigation, or other water in Great Britain, or into or in the sea within three miles of the shore of Great Britain, the carcase of an animal (including a horse) which has died of a contagious or infectious disease, or been slaughtered in consequence of being affected with a contagious or infectious disease, he shall be deemed guilty of an offence against this Order, unless he shows to the satisfaction of the Justices before whom he is charged that he did not know that the same had so died or been slaughtered, and that he could not with reasonable diligence have obtained that knowledge.

29. If an animal (including a horse) on board a vessel in Great Britain, or within three miles of the shore thereof, dies of a contagious or infectious disease, or is slaughtered in consequence of being affected with a contagious or infectious disease, the master of the vessel shall, with all practicable speed, cause the carcase thereof to be disinfected on board the vessel in such mode as the Privy Council from time to time direct or approve.

If without lawful excuse (proof whereof shall lie on him) he fails to do so, he shall be deemed guilty of an offence against this Order.

30. It shall not be lawful for any person, except with the license of the Privy Council, to dig up, or cause to be dug up, the carcase or any part of the carcase of an animal (including a horse) buried under a regulation of a Local Authority or under the direction of a receiver of wreck.

If any person acts in contravention of this Article, he shall be deemed guilty of an offence against this Order.

Chapter 4.—*Pleuro-Pneumonia.*

31. A Local Authority may, from time to time, with the view of preventing the spreading of pleuro-pneumonia, make regulations for the following purpose:

For prohibiting or regulating the removal of the carcases of any cattle that have been slaughtered in consequence of being affected with pleuro-pneumonia.

32. Every Local Authority shall cause all cattle affected with pleuro-pneumonia within their district to be slaughtered, and the following consequences shall ensue:

(1.) The Local Authority shall, by way of compensation for every animal so slaughtered, pay to the owner thereof such sum not exceeding thirty pounds and not exceeding three-fourths of the value of the animal immediately before it was affected with pleuro-pneumonia, as to the Local Authority seems fit.

(2.) They may require the value of the animal to be ascertained by their officers, or by arbitration, and generally they may impose conditions respecting evidence of the slaughter and value of the animal.

(3.) They may, if they think fit, withhold compensation in respect of an animal, where the owner or person having charge thereof has in their judgment been guilty, in relation to the animal, of any act in contravention of the Act of 1869, or of any Order, regulation, or license, of the Privy Council, or of a Local Authority, or has, in relation to the animal, failed to comply with the provisions of the Act of 1869, or

Appendix, No. 4.

of any such Order, regulation or license, in respect of the giving of notice of disease, or in any other respect.

33. Where the Local Authority under this Chapter cause an animal to be slaughtered, the owner thereof shall not be entitled to recover in respect of the insurance thereof any sum which, together with the compensation which he receives for the animal under this Chapter from the Local Authority, would exceed the sum which he would have been entitled to receive in respect of the insurance.

34. Every Local Authority shall keep, in such manner and form as the Privy Council from time to time direct or approve, a record, stating the date of any order made by them for slaughter under this Chapter and the execution of the order, and other proper particulars.

That record shall be evidence if a question arises concerning an order for the slaughter of an animal, or concerning compensation in respect thereof.

35. A Local Authority authorised by the Privy Council to put in operation this Article, may, from time to time, with the view of preventing the spreading of pleuro-pneumonia, prohibit or regulate the holding of any specified market, fair, auction, sale, or exhibition, of cattle within their district.

Chapter 5.—*Foot-and-Mouth Disease.*

36. A Local Authority may, from time to time, with the view of preventing the speading of foot-and-mouth disease, make regulations for the following purpose:

For prohibiting or regulating the movement out of a field, shed, or other premises in which foot-and-mouth disease has been found to exist, or from any land or building contiguous thereto in the same occupation, of an animal affected with foot-and-mouth disease, or that has been in contact with or in the same field, shed, or other premises with an animal affected with foot-and-mouth disease;

but nothing in this Article, or in any regulation of a Local Authority thereunder, shall be deemed to authorise the movement of an animal in contravention of Section fifty-seven of the Act of 1869, or of any other provision of that Act.

37. Where an animal becomes affected with foot-and-mouth disease while exposed or placed or being carried, led, or driven, as in Section fifty-seven of the Act of 1869 mentioned, it may, notwithstanding anything in that Section, be, with a license of an officer of the Local Authority authorised in this behalf, but not otherwise, moved for purposes of feeding, or watering, or other ordinary purposes connected with the breeding or rearing of animals, but not for any other purpose, to any land or building in the occupation of the owner of the animal, or for slaughter to the nearest slaughter-house or some other slaughter-house approved by the Local Authority.

The form of movement licensed in the First Schedule, or a form to the like effect, with such variations as circumstances require, shall be used under this Article.

Chapter 6.—*Sheep-Scab.*

38. A Local Authority may, from time to time, with the view of preventing the spreading of sheep-scab, make regulations for the following purposes, or either of them:

For prohibiting a person from having in his possession or under his charge a sheep affected with sheep-scab, without treating that sheep, or causing it to be treated, with some dressing or dipping or other remedy for sheep-scab.

For prohibiting or regulating the movement out of a field, shed, or other premises in which sheep-scab has been found to exist, of a sheep affected with sheep-scab, or that has been in contact with or in the same field, shed, or other premises with a sheep affected with sheep-scab;

but nothing in this Article, or in any regulation of a Local Authority thereunder, shall be deemed to authorise the movement of a sheep in contravention of Section fifty-seven of the Act of 1869, or of any other provision of that Act.

Chapter 7.—*Glanders.*

39. Where a person having a horse in his possession or under his charge gives notice under Article 5 that the horse is affected with glanders, or any person is convicted of an offence against this Order by reason of his having failed to give such a notice, then, if at any time thereafter it appears to the Local Authority, on a special report of an Inspector, being a member of the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons, that the horse is affected with glanders, and the horse is alive at the end of fourteen days after the receipt by the Local Authority of that special report, the Local Authority may serve on the owner of the horse a notice in writing requiring him to slaughter the horse, or permit them to slaughter it, within a time specified in the notice.

If in any case the owner fails to comply with the requisition of the notice, he shall be deemed guilty of an offence against this Order, unless he shows to the satisfaction of the Justices before whom he is charged that the horse is not affected with glanders, or that the slaughter thereof is for any reason unnecessary or inexpedient.

The provisions of this Article may be put in force, from time to time, as often as occasion requires, in relation to the same horse, on a further special report, as aforesaid.

40. A Local

40. A Local Authority may, from time to time, with the view of preventing the spreading of glanders, make regulations for the following purpose:

For prohibiting or regulating the movement out of a field, stable, shed, or other premises in which glanders has been found to exist, of a horse affected with glanders, or that has been in contact with or in the same field, stable, shed, or other premises with a horse affected with glanders:

but nothing in this Article, or in any regulation of a Local Authority thereunder, shall be deemed to authorise the movement of a horse in contravention of Section fifty-seven of the Act of 1869, or of any other provision of that Act.

Chapter 8.—*Farcy.*

41. Farcy is a contagious disease for the purposes of the Act of 1869, and the provisions of Sections sixty and sixty-one of that Act specifying glanders shall extend to farcy.

42. A Local Authority may, from time to time, with a view of preventing the spreading of farcy, make regulations for the following purpose:

For prohibiting or regulating the movement out of a field, stable, shed, or other premises in which farcy has been found to exist, of a horse affected with farcy, or that has been in contact with or in the same field, stable, shed, or other premises with a horse affected with farcy;

but nothing in this Article, or in any regulation of a Local Authority thereunder, shall be deemed to authorise the movement of a horse in contravention of Section fifty-seven of the Act of 1869, or of any other provision of that Act.

PART II.

Transit of Animals.

Chapter 9.—*Transit by Sea.*

43. In this Part the term animals extends to all ruminating animals and to horses.

44. With respect to places used for animals on board vessels, the following regulations shall have effect:

(1.) Every such place shall be divided into pens by substantial divisions.

(2.) Each pen shall not exceed nine feet in breadth, or fifteen feet in length.

(3.) The floor of each pen shall have proper battens or other foot-holds thereon.

(4.) Every such place, if inclosed, shall be ventilated by means of separate inlet and outlet openings, of such size and position as will secure a proper supply of air to the place in all states of weather.

45. Between each first day of November and the next following thirtieth day of April (both days inclusive) freshly shorn sheep shall not be carried on the deck of a vessel.

46. Where sheep are carried on the deck of a vessel, proper gangways shall be provided either between or above the pens in which they are carried.

47. Animals landed from a vessel shall, on a certificate of an Inspector of the Privy Council, certifying to the effect that the foregoing regulations, or some or one of them, have not or has not been observed in the vessel, be detained, at the place of landing, or in lairs adjacent thereto, until the Privy Council otherwise direct.

Chapter 10.—*Shipping and Unshipping Places.*

48. At every place where animals are put on board of or landed from vessels, provision shall be made, to the satisfaction of the Privy Council, for a supply of water for animals; and water shall be supplied there, gratuitously, on request of any person having charge of any animal.

49. At every place where animals are landed from vessels, provision shall be made, to the satisfaction of the Privy Council, for the speedy and convenient unshipment of animals, and for a supply of food for them; and food shall be supplied there, on request of any person having charge of any animal, at such price as the Privy Council, from time to time, approve.

Chapter 11.—*Transit by Railway.*

50. Every truck shall be provided with spring buffers, and the floor thereof shall have proper battens or other foot-holds thereon.

51. A railway company shall not allow any truck to be overcrowded so as to cause unnecessary suffering to the animals therein.

Appendix, No. 4.

52. Between each first day of November and the next following thirtieth day of April (both days inclusive), trucks used for carrying sheep freshly shorn and unclothed shall be covered and inclosed so as to protect the sheep from the weather, but shall be properly ventilated.

Chapter 12.—*Offences.*

53. If anything is done or omitted to be done in contravention of any of the foregoing provisions of this Part, the owner and the master of the vessel in which,—and the owner and the occupier of the place where animals are put on board of or landed from vessels at which, and the railway company carrying animals on or owning or working the railway on which,—and also, in case of the overcrowding of a truck on a railway, or of the carrying on a railway of sheep freshly shorn and unclothed, the consignor of the animals in respect of which—(as the case may be), the same is done or omitted, shall each be deemed guilty of an offence against this Order:

But no person shall be liable to a penalty under this Part in respect of sheep as freshly shorn, where it is proved that the sheep have not been shorn within sixty days before the time of the commission of the alleged offence.

Chapter 13.—*Water Supply on Railways.*

54. The railway companies working the railways named in the Second Schedule shall make a provision of water, to the satisfaction of the Privy Council, at each of the stations therein named, for animals carried or about to be or having been carried on those railways.

PART III.

Foreign Animals.

Chapter 14.—*Foreign Animals Generally.*

55. This Part shall have effect subject and by way of supplement to Parts I. and II.; and nothing in this Part shall interfere with the execution or discarge by a Local Authority, or by an Inspector or other officer of a Local Authority, or by a constable, or by any person, of any power or duty conferred or imposed on them or him by the Act of 1869, or by Part I. or Part II., or by any other Order of Council, or relieve them or him from the obligation to execute and discharge the same.

56. This Chapter applies to all foreign animals.

57. In Regulation 5 of the Fourth Schedule to the Act of 1869 the words Privy Council shall be deemed to be substituted for the words Commissioners of Customs.

58. Where a vessel comes into port having on board foreign animals maimed or injured on the voyage, the owner, consignee, or other person in charge thereof, or the master of the vessel, shall, if directed by the Inspector of the Privy Council, or may if he thinks fit, slaughter those animals or any of them immediately on their being landed; but the carcase, hide, skin, hair, wool, horn, hoof, or offal of any such animal or any part thereof is not to be moved from the place of landing, or some lair or slaughter-house adjacent thereto approved by the Privy Council, without a certificate from the Inspector certifying that it is not likely to introduce or spread contagious or infectious disease.

59. Where any regulation relating to foreign animals is in operation, the Local Authority and all constables and police officers shall assist the Inspector of the Privy Council to carry the same into effect and to enforce the same, and shall do or cause to be done all things from time to time necessary for the effectual execution of the same.

60. If a vessel arriving has on board the carcase of a foreign animal (including a horse) which was taken on board for the purpose of importation, but has died on the voyage, the master of the vessel shall, immediately on arrival, report the fact to the Principal Officer of customs at the port.

The carcase shall not be landed or discharged from the vessel without the permission in writing of the Principal Officer.

61. Where it appears to the Principal Officer of Customs with respect to any foreign animal (including any animal not within the definition of animal in this Order), or any hay, straw, fodder, or other article, brought by sea, that contagious or infectious disease may be thereby conveyed to animals, he may seize and detain the same, and he shall forthwith report the facts to the Commissioners of Customs, who may give such directions as they think fit, either for the slaughter or destruction or the further detention thereof, or for the restoration thereof, to the owner on such conditions, if any (including payment by the owner of expenses incurred by them in respect of detention thereof), as they think fit.

62. A defined part of a port for cattle shall be deemed a defined part of the same port for animals.

63. Foreign

63. Foreign animals shall not be landed at any place except the ports following:

Barrow-in-Furness.	Grimsby.	Newhaven.
Bristol.	Hartlepool.	Penzance.
Cardiff.	Harwich.	Plymouth.
Dartmouth.	Hull.	Portsmouth.
Dover.	Kirkwall.	Shields, North.
Falmouth.	Leith.	Shields, South.
Folkestone.	Littlehampton.	Shoreham.
Glasgow.	Liverpool.	Southampton.
Goole.	London.	Sunderland.
Grangemouth.	Middlesbrough.	Weymouth.
Granton.	Newcastle-upon-Tyne.	

64. Foreign animals shall not be landed except in such manner, within such times, and subject to such surpervision and control, as the Commissioners of Customs from time to time direct, and when landed shall be placed under the charge of an Inspector of the Privy Council, and shall be dealt with in accordance with instructions from time to time given by the Privy Council.

65. Foreign animals shall be detained in some lair or other proper place adjacent to the place of landing, and shall be inspected by an Inspector of the Privy Council.

The detention shall continue for at least twelve hours reckoned from the time of the landing of the last animal of the cargo, whether the whole cargo is landed continuously without intermission at one place, or part thereof is landed at one place and part at another place, or parts thereof are landed at different times at the same place.

If a contagious or infectious disease is detected in any animal of the cargo, every animal in each separate part of the cargo shall be dealt with as if that disease had been detected in an animal in each separate part.

If more contagious or infectious diseases than one are detected in an animal or animals of the cargo, every animal in each separate part of the cargo shall be slaughtered, destroyed, or otherwise dealt with in accordance with instructions from time to time given by the Privy Council.

This Article is subject to the provisions of Chapter 20.

66. Where a foreign animal forming part of one cargo has not been kept separate from a foreign animal forming part of another cargo, all the animals forming those cargoes shall be treated as forming one cargo.

67. An Inspector of the Privy Council may detain, for any period that he thinks necessary or proper, a foreign animal (including an animal not within the definition of animal in this Order) which he has reason to suspect is affected with or may introduce a contagious or infectious disease.

68. If any foreign sheep or swine are found to be affected with a contagious or infectious disease (not being cattle-plague), they shall be kept separate from those of the same cargo not found to be affected with a contagious or infectious disease; and notwithstanding Article 65 the slaughter of those not found to be so affected may, with the permission of an Inspector of the Privy Council, be begun at any time before the expiration of the twelve hours detention, and be continued without intermission.

69. No animal, carcase, hide, meat, or offal, and no hay, straw, litter, or other thing commonly used for food of animals, or otherwise for or about animals, and no dung, shall be removed from the lair or other place adjacent to the place of landing where foreign animals are detained, except with the permission of an Inspector of the Privy Council.

If the Inspector is of opinion that any such animal or thing as aforesaid may introduce a contagious or infectious disease, the same shall be slaughtered, destroyed, or otherwise dealt with in accordance with instructions from time to time given by the Privy Council.

CHAPTER 15.—*Cattle from Austria-Hungary, Belgium, France, Germany (subject to Chapter* 18.—Cattle from Schleswig and Holstein), *Greece, Italy, and Turkey.*

70. All the regulations of the Fourth Schedule to the Act of 1869 shall apply to cattle brought from any of the countries comprised in the following

Schedule:

The Austrian-Hungarian Empire.
Belgium.
France.
The German Empire (subject to Chapter 18.—*Cattle from Schleswig and Holstein*).
The dominions of the King of the Hellenes.
The dominions of the King of Italy.
The dominions of the Sultan.

Appendix, No. 4.

71. Cattle brought from any of the countries scheduled in Article 70 shall not be landed except at a landing-place within the respective defined parts of the following ports:

Dover.	Littlehampton.
Glasgow.	London.
Goole.	Middlesbrough.
Granton.	Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
Grimsby.	Plymouth.
Hartlepool.	Shields, North.
Hull.	Southampton.
Leith.	Sunderland.

CHAPTER 16.—*Animals in Defined Parts of Ports.*

72. All cattle landed in a defined part of a port shall be slaughtered within ten days after the landing thereof, exclusive of the day of landing.

But this Article shall operate subject to the special provisions of Orders of Council defining parts of ports.

73. Foreign cattle, sheep, goats, and swine, in a defined part of a port (except sheep, goats, and swine in a defined part of the Port of London) shall be marked as follows:

Cattle.—By clipping a broad arrow, about five inches long, on the left quarter (in addition to clipping the hair off the end of the tail, as prescribed by Regulation 4 of the Fourth Schedule to the Act of 1869).

Sheep and Goats.—By clipping a broad arrow, about four inches long, on the forehead.

Swine.—By printing a broad arrow about three inches long, on the left side, with the following composition, namely:—rosin, five parts; oil of turpentine, two parts; red ochre, one part; melted, and used warm.

CHAPTER 17.—*Animals landed out of Defined Parts of Ports.*

74. The landing of foreign cattle elsewhere than in a defined part of a port shall be subject to the following conditions:

First. That the vessel in which they are imported has not, within three months before taking them on board, had on board any cattle exported or carried coastwise from a port or place in any country which at the time of that exportation or carrying coastwise was scheduled in Article 70, or from a port or place in the dominions of the Emperor of Russia.

Second. That the vessel has not, since taking on board the cattle imported, entered any such port or place.

Third. That the cattle imported have not, while on board the vessel, been in contact with any cattle exported or carried coastwise from any such port or place, or with any sheep or goats exported or carried coastwise from a port or place in the dominions of the Emperor of Russia.

And those foreign cattle shall not be landed elsewhere than in a defined part of a port, unless and until—

(1.) The owner or charterer of the vessel in which they are imported, or his agent in Great Britain, has entered into a bond to Her Majesty the Queen, in a sum not exceeding one thousand pounds, with or without a surety or sureties, to the satisfaction of the Commissioners of Customs, conditioned for the observance of the foregoing conditions in relation to cattle to be landed under this Chapter from the vessel; and

(2.) The master of the vessel has on each occasion of importation of cattle therein satisfied the Commissioners of Customs or their proper officer, by declaration made and signed or otherwise, that none of the cattle then imported therein have been exported from a port or place in any of the countries scheduled in Article 70, or from a port or place in the dominions of the Emperor of Russia, and that the foregoing conditions have been observed in relation to all the cattle then imported therein.

75. Foreign animals landed elsewhere than in a defined part of a port shall not be moved therefrom or be allowed to come in contact with any other animals until they have been examined by an inspector of the Privy Council; and according to the result of that inspection the following consequences shall ensue:

(1.) If the Inspector certifies that all the animals landed from the same vessel are free from contagious or infectious disease, they shall thereupon cease to be deemed foreign animals.

(2.) If

(2.) If the Inspector certifies, with respect to any one or more of the animals landed from the vessel, that it or they is or are affected with a contagious or infectious disease, all the animals then imported in the vessel shall be slaughtered or otherwise dealt with in accordance with instructions from time to time given by the Privy Council.

CHAPTER 18.—*Cattle from Schleswig and Holstein.*

76. This Chapter applies to cattle brought from a port or place in either of the parts of the German Empire respectively known as Schleswig and as Holstein, and to no other cattle.

77. This Chapter shall take effect from and immediately after the twenty-third day of June in each year, and shall cease to have effect from and immediately after the seventh day of December following, and for and in respect of that period in each year Schleswig and Holstein shall not, for the purposes of Article 70, be deemed parts of the German Empire.

78. Notwithstanding Article 70, the regulations of the Fourth Schedule to the Act of 1869, shall not apply to cattle brought in conformity with the provisions of this Chapter.

79. All the provisions of Chapter 17 shall apply to the landing elsewhere than in a defined part of a port of cattle brought under this Chapter from a port of Schleswig or of Holstein, and, in addition, the landing thereof shall be subject to the following conditions:

First. That the owner, agent, or charterer of the vessel in which they are brought has in the year of importation received the special permission of the Privy Council to employ the vessel in the trade of importation of cattle from ports of Schleswig and of Holstein, or of either of them, under this Chapter.

Second. That the cattle imported are accompanied by a declaration and certificates, such as are indicated in the forms in the Third Schedule, or to the like effect.

80. If an Inspector of the Privy Council is of opinion, on the examination of any cattle imported under this Chapter, that the declaration accompanying them required by Article 79 is untrue in any particular, as regards any one of the cattle in the vessel, then all the animals in the vessel shall be detained and dealt with in accordance with instructions from time to time given by the Privy Council.

81. If the declaration accompanying any cattle imported under this Chapter, required by Article 79, is untrue in any particular, as regards any one of the cattle to which it relates, the master of the vessel shall be deemed guilty of an offence against this Order with respect to all the cattle to which the declaration relates, unless he shows to the satisfaction of the justices before whom he is charged, that he did not know of the same being so untrue, and that he could not with reasonable diligence have obtained that knowledge.

CHAPTER 19.—*Animals and Articles from Russia.*

82. Cattle brought from a port or place in the dominions of the Emperor of Russia, and cattle, sheep, or goats being or having been on board a vessel at the same time with cattle so brought, shall not be landed in Great Britain.

83. The following articles brought from a port or place in the dominions of the Emperor of Russia shall not be landed in Great Britain:

Manure; hay.

84. All the regulations of the Fourth Schedule to the Act of 1869 shall apply to sheep and goats (not prohibited) brought to Great Britain from the dominions of the Emperor of Russia.

85. Sheep and goats so brought shall not be landed except at a landing-place within the respective defined parts of the ports named in Article 71, and they shall be slaughtered within ten days after the landing thereof, exclusive of the day of landing.

But this Article shall as regards the ports of

Granton,	Southampton,
Leith,	

operate subject to the special provisions of Orders of Council defining parts of those three ports.

86. The following articles brought from a port or place in the dominions of the Emperor of Russia shall not be landed in Great Britain, except at a port named in Article 63, and shall not be removed from the place where they are landed except with a certificate of an Inspector of the Privy Council, certifying that they are not likely to introduce contagious or infectious disease:

Meat; hides; fat; hoofs; horns.

Appendix, No. 4.

CHAPTER 20.—*Milch Cows and Surplus Ships' Stores.*

87. Notwithstanding Chapters 15 and 19, the regulations of the Fourth Schedule to the Act of 1869 shall not apply to a milch-cow brought from a port or place in one of the countries scheduled in Article 70, or from a port or place in the dominions of the Emperor of Russia, provided the Commissioners of Customs are, on each occasion of the same being so brought, satisfied that it has been taken from Great Britain to that port or place, and has not been landed at that port or place, or at any other port or place in any of those countries or in those dominions, and has not been in contact with any other foreign animal (not being an animal coming under the provisions of this chapter).

In relation to the landing, on any occasion, elsewhere than in a defined part of a port, of any such milch-cow, the condition that the vessel has not, since taking on board the cattle imported, entered a port or place in any of those countries or in those dominions, shall not operate, provided the Commissioners of Customs are, on each occasion, satisfied as aforesaid.

Every such milch-cow shall, if landed, be detained for at least twelve hours in some lair or other proper place adjacent to the place of landing, unless accompanied with a certificate of an Inspector of the Privy Council, certifying that it is free from contagious or infectious disease.

88. A foreign animal which is brought from a port or place in a country other than one of the countries scheduled in Article 70, or the dominions of the Emperor of Russia, but which was not taken on board for importation into Great Britain, and has not been in contact with any other foreign animal (not being an animal coming under the provisions of this Chapter), shall, if landed, be detained for at least twelve hours in some lair or other proper place adjacent to the place of landing, unless accompanied with a certificate of an Inspector of the Privy Council, certifying that it is free from contagious or infectious disease.

PART IV

GENERAL PROVISIONS.

CHAPTER 21.—*Local Authorities.*

89. A Local Authority may, from time to time, revoke or alter any Order, prohibition, or regulation made by them under the Act of 1869, or any Order of Council.

90. Every Local Authority shall send to the Privy Council a copy of every Order, prohibition, or regulation made by them.

91. If the Privy Council are satisfied on inquiry, with respect to any prohibition or regulation made by a Local Authority under the Act of 1869, or any Order of Council, that the same is of too restrictive a character, or otherwise objectionable, and direct the revocation thereof, the same shall thereupon cease to operate.

92. Whenever an inspector is appointed under Section 12 of the Act of 1869, or there is any change in the name or address or district of such an Inspector, the Local Authority shall forthwith report the same to the Privy Council.

93. Except where otherwise provided for in any Order of Council, a Local Authority shall provide and supply, without charge, printed copies of documents or forms requisite under the Act of 1869, or any Order of Council.

94. Every regulation made by a Local Authority under any Order of Council shall (where no other provision is made for the publication thereof) be published by advertisement in a newspaper circulating in the district of the Local Authority.

95. All Orders and regulations made by a Local Authority under any former Order of Council and in force at the commencement of this Order shall, as far as the same are not varied by or inconsistent with this Order, remain in force until altered or revoked by the Local Authority.

96. Forms of Movement Licenses which have been before the date of this Order printed or otherwise prepared for use by a Local Authority, under the Foot-and-Mouth Disease Order of 1874, may be used for the purposes of Article 37.

CHAPTER 22.—*General Offences.*

97. If any person fails to give, produce, do, or observe any notice, license, thing, or rule, which he is by this Order, or by any Order or regulation of a Local Authority thereunder required to give, produce, do, or observe, he shall be deemed guilty of an offence against this Order.

98. If

98. If any animal (including a horse) or anything is moved or dealt with in contravention of this Order, or of any Order or regulation of a Local Authority thereunder, the owner thereof and the person directing or permitting the moving thereof, or dealing therewith, and the person or company having charge of or removing or conveying the same, shall each be deemed guilty of an offence against this Order.

(signed) *C. L. Peel.*

THE FIRST SCHEDULE.

Foot-and-Mouth Disease.—Form of Movement License.

* No.

Dated this of 18 .

Name and address of owner, or his or her agent -

Number of animals

Description of ditto

Route

From

Through

To

Purpose

[To be signed]

* This number must correspond with that on the license.

This counterfoil is to be retained by the person granting the license.

Caution.—Persons fabricating or altering or committing other offences with respect to licenses are liable, under The Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869, to fine or imprisonment.

FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE.

Movement License.

* No.

I, *A.B.*, of , being an Officer authorised by the Local Authority of the of under the Order of the Lords of the Privy Council in this behalf to issue licenses for the movement of animals becoming affected with foot-and-mouth disease while exposed or placed or being carried, led, or driven, as mentioned in Section 57 of The Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869, hereby license the person undermentioned, being the owner of the undermentioned animals, or his [*or* her] agent, to move the said animals from to by the undermentioned route for the undermentioned purpose:

Number and Description of Animals.	Name and Address of Owner, or his or her Agent.	Route to be taken.	Purposes for which Movement is licensed.	Remarks.
		From Through To		

The time allowed for removals under this license is two days, from and after to-day.

[To be signed]

Dated this day of 18 .

* This number must correspond with that on the counterfoil.

Caution.—Persons fabrica ing or altering or committing other offences with respect to licenses are liable, under The Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869, to fine or imprisonment.

THE SECOND SCHEDULE.

Railway Stations at which Water is to be provided for Animals.

Name of Station.	Name of Railway.
Aberdeen	Caledonian.
Aberfeldy	Highland.
Abergavenny	Great Western.
Accrington	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Afon Wen	Cambrian.
Alford	Great Northern.
Alford (Aberdeenshire)	Great North of Scotland.
Almond Bank	Caledonian.
Alnwick	North-Eastern.
Alston	North-Eastern.
Alyth	Caledonian.
Ampthill	Midland.
Annan	Glasgow and South-Western.
Appledore	South-Eastern.
Arbroath	Caledonian.
Ardler	Caledonian.
Ardrossan	Glasgow and South-Western.
Ardwick	Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire.
Arundel	London, Brighton, and South Coast.
Ashbourne	North Staffordshire.
Ashford	South-Eastern.
Ashton-under-Lyne	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Ashton-under-Lyne	Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire.
Aspatria	Maryport and Carlisle.
Auchterarder	Caledonian.
Aylesbury	Aylesbury and Buckingham, and Great Western.
Aylesbury	London and North-Western.
Ayr	Glasgow and South-Western.
Bacup	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Balfron	North British.
Balloch	North British.
Banbury	Great Western.
Banbury	London and North-Western.
Banff	Great North of Scotland.
Bangor	London and North-Western.
Barnard Castle	North-Eastern.
Barnet	Great Northern.
Barnsley	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Barnstaple	London and South-Western.
Barrhead	Glasgow, Barrhead, and Kilmarnock Joint.
Barrow	Furness.
Basingstoke Junction	London and South-Western.
Beattock	Caledonian.
Beccles	Great Eastern.
Bedale	North-Eastern.
Bedford	London and North-Western.
Bedford	Midland.
Belford	North-Eastern.
Bellgrove	City of Glasgow Union.
Beverley	North-Eastern.
Bicester	London and North-Western.
Birkenhead (New Station).	Great Western.
Birkenhead (Joint Station).	London and North-Western, and Great Western.
Birmingham	Great Western.
Birmingham	London and North-Western.
Birmingham	Midland.
Bishop Auckland	North-Eastern.
Bishops Stortford	Great Eastern.
Bishopstoke Junction	London and South Western.
Blackburn	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Blackford	Caledonian.
Blairgowrie	Caledonian.
Bletchley	London and North-Western.
Blythe Bridge	North Staffordshire.
Bodmin-road	Cornwall.
Bolton	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Bolton	London and North-Western.
Bonar Bridge	Highland.
Boroughbridge	North-Eastern.
Boston	Great Northern.
Botley	London and South-Western.
Bradford	Great Northern.
Bradford	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Bradford	Midland.
Braintree	Great Eastern.
Brechin	Caledonian.
Bridge of Dun	Caledonian.
Bridgwater	Bristol and Exeter.
Bridlington	North Eastern.
Brighouse	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Bristol	Bristol and Exeter.
Bristol	Great Western.
Bristol	Midland.
Brockholes	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Bromsgrove	Midland.
Broughty Ferry	Caledonian.
Builth	Mid Wales.
Bullgill	Maryport and Carlisle.
Burnley (Bank Top)	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Burntisland	North British.
Burslem	North Staffordshire.
Burton	Midland.
Bury	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Bury St. Edmund's	Great Eastern.
Buxton	Midland.
Callandar	Caledonian.
Cambridge	Great Eastern.
Cambridge	London and North-Western.
Canterbury	London, Chatham, and Dover.
Canterbury	South-Eastern.
Cardiff	Rhymney.
Carlisle	Caledonian.
Carlisle	London and North-Western.
Carlisle	Maryport and Carlisle.
Carlisle	North British.
Carlisle (Goods)	North-Eastern.
Carmarthen	Great Western.
Carmarthen	Llanelly Railway and Dock.
Carnarvon	London and North-Western.
Carnforth	London and North-Western.
Carnoustie	Caledonian.
Castle Douglas	Glasgow and South-Western.
Castleton	North-Eastern.
Chatburn	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Chatham	London, Chatham, and Dover.
Chelmsford	Great Eastern.
Chester (Joint Station)	London and North-Western, and Great Western.
Chesterfield	Midland.
Chichester	London, Brighton, and South Coast.

Name of Station.	Name of Railway.
Chippenham	Great Western.
Cirencester	Great Western.
Cleckheaton	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Clitheroe	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Cockermouth	Cockermouth, Keswick, and Penrith.
Colchester	Great Eastern.
Colne	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Congleton	North Staffordshire.
Cooper Bridge	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Cornhill	North-Eastern.
Corwen	Great Western.
Cosham	London and South-Western.
Coupar Angus	Caledonian.
Craven Arms	London and North-Western and Great Western (Joint Lines).
Crediton	London and South-Western.
Creetown	Caledonian.
Cresswell	North Staffordshire.
Crewe	London and North-Western.
Criccieth	Cambrian.
Crieff	Caledonian.
Croston	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Cupar	North British.
Dalkeith (or Eskbank)	North British.
Dalwhinnie	Highland.
Darlington (N.E.)	North-Eastern.
Darlington (S. & D.)	North Eastern.
Dartford	South-Eastern.
Denbigh	London and North-Western.
Denny	Caledonian.
Derby	Midland.
Dereham	Great Eastern.
Dewsbury	London and North Western.
Didcot	Great Western.
Dingwall	Highland.
Diss	Great Eastern.
Doncaster	Great Northern.
Doncaster	Midland.
Dorchester	London and South Western.
Doune	Caledonian.
Dover	London, Chatham, and Dover.
Driffield	North Eastern.
Dubton	Caledonian.
Dudley	Great Western.
Dumfries	Caledonian.
Dumfries	Glasgow and South-Western.
Dunbar	North British.
Dunblane	Caledonian.
Dundee	Caledonian.
Dunfermline	North British.
Dunkeld	Highland.
Dunmow	Great Eastern.
Dunning	Caledonian.
Dunse	North British.
East Linton	North British.
Ecclefechan	Caledonian.
Edinburgh	Caledonian.
Edinburgh (Haymarket)	North British.
Edinburgh (Scotland-street).	North British.
Edinburgh (Waverley)	North British.
Eggesford	London and South-Western.
Elgin (Morayshire Station)	Great North of Scotland.
Elgin	Highland.
Ellon	Great North of Scotland.
Elstree	Midland.
Ely	Great Eastern.
Epping	Great Eastern.
Errol	Caledonian.
Evesham	Great Western.
Evesham	Midland.
Exeter (St. Davids)	Bristol and Exeter.
Exeter	London and South-Western.
Fakenham	Great Eastern.
Falkirk Tryst Sidings	Caledonian.
Fareham	London and South-Western.
Farningham Road	London, Chatham, and Dover.
Faversham	London, Chatham, and Dover.
Ferryhill	North-Eastern.
Fleetwood	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Fordoun	Caledonian.
Forfar	Caledonian.
Forres	Highland.
Forteviot	Caledonian.
Fourstones	North-Eastern.
Frome	Great Western.
Galashiels	North British.
Garstang	London and North-Western.
Girvan	Glasgow and South-Western.
Glasgow	Caledonian.
Glasgow	Glasgow and South-Western.
Glasgow (Sighthill)	North British
Glastonbury	Somerset and Dorset.
Gloucester	Great Western.
Gloucester	Midland
Golspie	Highland.
Goole	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Gosport	London and South-Western.
Grahamston	North British.
Grampound Road	Cornwall.
Grantham	Great Northern.
Granton (near Edinburgh).	North British.
Grantown	Highland.
Gravesend	South-Eastern.
Great Yarmouth (Vauxhall).	Great Eastern.
Greenloaning	Caledonian.
Greenock	Caledonian.
Grimsby	Great Northern.
Grimsby (Dock Station)	Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire.
Grosmont	North-Eastern.
Guildford Junction	London and South-Western.
Guthrie	Caledonian.
Gwyddelwern	Denbigh, Ruthin, and Corwen.
Haddington	North British
Hadleigh	Great Eastern.
Hailsham	London, Brighton, and South Coast.
Halesworth	Great Eastern.
Halifax	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Haltwhistle	North-Eastern.
Ham Street	South-Eastern.
Hanley	North Staffordshire.
Harlington	Midland.
Harlow	Great Eastern.
Harrow	London and North-Western.
Harwich	Great Eastern.
Hastings (Joint Station)	South-Eastern, and London, Brighton, and South Coast.
Hatfield	Great Northern.
Hawick	North British.
Hay	Hereford, Hay, and Brecon.
Haydon Bridge	North-Eastern.
Headcorn	South-Eastern.
Hebden Bridge	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Heckmondwike	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Hendon	Midland.
Hereford (Barton)	Great Western.
Hereford (Joint Station)	London and North-Western, and Great Western.

Name of Station.	Name of Railway.
Herne Hill	London, Chatham, and Dover.
Hertford	Great Eastern.
Hexham	North-Eastern.
Heyford	Great Western.
Highbridge	Bristol and Exeter.
Highbridge	Somerset and Dorset.
Highlandman	Caledonian.
Hindley	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Hitchin	Great Northern.
Hitchin	Midland.
Hoghton	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Holmfirth	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Holyhead	London and North Western.
Horley	London, Brighton, and South Coast.
Hornby	Midland.
Horsham	London, Brighton, and South Coast.
Huddersfield	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Huddersfield	London and North-Western.
Hull (Goods)	North-Eastern.
Huntingdon	Great Northern.
Huntly	Great North of Scotland.
Invergordon	Highland.
Inverness	Highland.
Inverurie	Great North of Scotland.
Ipswich	Great Eastern.
Keith	Great North of Scotland.
Kelso	North British.
Kendal	London and North-Western.
Keswick	Cockermouth, Keswick, & Penrith.
Kettering	Midland.
Kibworth	Midland.
Kidderminster	Great Western.
Kilmarnock	Glasgow and South-Western.
Kinbuck	Caledonian.
Kington	Great Western.
Kingussie	Highland.
Kinross	North British.
Kirkby Stephen	North-Eastern.
Kirkcudbright	Glasgow and South-Western.
Kirkham	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Kittybrewster	Great North of Scotland.
Knaresborough	North-Eastern.
Knighton	London and North-Western.
Knottingley	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Ladybank	North British.
Lanark	Caledonian.
Lancaster	London and North-Western.
Larbert	Caledonian.
Laurencekirk	Caledonian.
Leeds (Low Level)	Great Northern.
Leeds	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Leeds	London and North Western.
Leeds	Midland.
Leeds (Wellington-street).	North-Eastern.
Leek	North Staffordshire.
Leeming Lane	North-Eastern.
Leicester	Midland.
Leighton	London and North-Western.
Leith	Caledonian.
Leith (South)	North British.
Leominster	London and North-Western and Great Western (Joint Lines).
Leuchars	North British.
Lewes	London, Brighton, and South Coast.
Leyburn	North-Eastern.
Lichfield	London and North-Western.
Lincoln	Great Northern.
Lincoln	Midland.
Linlithgow	North British.
Liskeard	Cornwall.
Littlehampton	London, Brighton, and South Coast.
Littleport	Great Eastern.
Liverpool	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Liverpool (Canada Dock)	London and North-Western.
Liverpool (Stanley)	London and North-Western.
Liverpool (Waterloo)	London and North-Western.
Llandilo	Llanelly Railway and Dock.
Lockerbie	Caledonian.
London (Stratford)	Great Eastern.
London (Goods Yard)	Great Northern.
London (Holloway)	Great Northern.
London (King's Cross)	Great Northern.
London (Paddington)	Great Western.
London (Maiden Lane)	London and North-Western.
London (Nine Elms)	London and South-Western.
London (Kentish Town)	Midland.
London (Bricklayers Arms).	South-Eastern.
Long Preston	Midland.
Longtown	North British.
Loughborough	Midland.
Low Moor	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Ludlow	London and North-Western and Great Western (Joint Lines).
Luton	Midland.
Lynn	Great Eastern.
Lytham	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Macclesfield	North Staffordshire.
Magor	Great Western.
Maidstone	London, Chatham, and Dover.
Maidstone	South-Eastern.
Maldon	Great Eastern.
Malton	North-Eastern.
Manchester (Oldham-road).	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Manchester (Liverpool-road).	London and North-Western.
Manchester (London-road).	London and North-Western.
Manchester (Ordsall-lane).	London and North-Western.
Manchester	Midland.
Mansfield	Midland.
March	Great Eastern.
Margate	South-Eastern.
Market Drayton	North Staffordshire.
Market Harborough	Midland.
Market Weighton	North-Eastern.
Markinch	North British.
Marshfield	Great Western.
Maryport	Maryport and Carlisle.
Masborough	Midland.
Meigle	Caledonian.
Mellis	Great Eastern.
Melmerby	North-Eastern.
Melton	Great Eastern.
Melton	Midland.
Merthyr	Great Western.
Methley Junction	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Methven	Caledonian.
Middlesborough	North Eastern.
Milford	Great Western.
Milford Junction	North-Eastern.
Minster	South-Eastern.
Mirfield	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Monmouth	Great Western.
Montrose	Caledonian.
Moorfields (Hereford)	Hereford, Hay, and Brecon.
Morecambe	Midland.
Morpeth	North-Eastern.
Moulsford	Great Western.
Muir of Ord	Highland.

Name of Station.	Name of Railway.
Nairn	Highland.
Neath Yard	Neath and Brecon.
Newark	Great Northern.
Newark	Midland.
Newbridge-on-Wye	Mid-Wales.
Newcastle (Forth Station).	North-Eastern.
Newcastle	North Staffordshire.
Newhaven	London, Brighton, and South Coast.
Newmarket	Great Eastern.
New Milford	Great Western.
Newport (Monmouthshire).	Great Western.
Newport (Monmouthshire).	Monmouthshire Railway and Canal.
Newton	South Devon.
Newton Stewart	Caledonian.
Normanton	Midland.
Northallerton	North-Eastern.
Northampton	London and North-Western.
Northampton	Midland.
North Dean	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
North Tawton	London and South-Western.
Norton Bridge	North Staffordshire.
Norwich (Trowse)	Great Eastern.
Nottingham	Great Northern.
Nottingham	Midland.
Oakham	Midland.
Oldham	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Oldham (Glodwick-road)	London and North-Western.
Oldham (Clegg-street)	Oldham, Ashton-under-Lyne, and Guide Bridge.
Old Meldrum	Great North of Scotland.
Ongar	Great Eastern.
Ormskirk	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Oswestry	Great Western.
Oxenholme	London and North-Western.
Oxford	Great Western.
Oxford	London and North-Western.
Paddock Wood	South-Eastern.
Paisley	Glasgow and South-Western.
Peebles	North British.
Penrith	London and North-Western.
Penzance	West Cornwall.
Perth (North)	Caledonian.
Perth (South)	Caledonian.
Perth	North British.
Peterborough	Great Eastern.
Peterborough	Great Northern.
Peterborough	London and North-Western.
Peterborough	Midland.
Petersfield	London and South-Western.
Pevensey	London, Brighton, and South Coast.
Pickering	North-Eastern.
Piel	Furness.
Pimbo Lane	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Pitlochry	Highland.
Plymouth	South Devon.
Pontefract	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Portmadock	Cambrian.
Portpatrick	Caledonian.
Portsmouth (Lancashire)	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Portsmouth (Joint Station).	London and South-Western, and London, Brighton, and South Coast.
Preston	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Preston (Maudlands)	London and North-Western.
Preston (Oxhey Market)	London and North-Western.
Pwllheli	Cambrian.
Queenborough	London, Chatham, and Dover.
Radcliffe	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Rainford Junction	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Ramsbottom	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Ramsgate	South-Eastern.
Rawtenstall	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Reading	South-Eastern.
Redhill	London, Brighton, and South Coast.
Redhill	South-Eastern.
Retford	Great Northern.
Retford	Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire.
Rhayader	Mid-Wales.
Rhuddlan	London and North-Western.
Rhymney	Rhymney.
Richmond	North-Eastern.
Ringwood	London and South-Western.
Ripon	North Eastern.
Rochester	North Staffordshire.
Rochdale	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Romford	Great Eastern.
Romsey	London and South-Western.
Rotherham	Midland.
Rugby	London and North-Western.
Rye	South-Eastern.
Saffron Walden	Great Eastern.
St. Albans	Great Northern.
St. Albans	Midland.
St. Andrews	North British.
St. Boswells (New Town)	North British.
St. Ives	Great Eastern.
Salford	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Salisbury	Great Western.
Salisbury	London and South-Western.
Sampford Courtnay	London and South-Western.
Sandal	Great Northern.
Sandwich	South-Eastern.
Sanquhar	Glasgow and South-Western.
Saxmundham	Great Eastern.
Seamer Junction	North-Eastern.
Selby	North-Eastern.
Settle	Midland.
Shalford	South-Eastern.
Sheffield	Midland.
Shrewsbury	Great Western.
Shrewsbury	London and North-Western.
Silloth	North British.
Sirhowy	Sirhowy.
Sittingbourne	London, Chatham, and Dover.
Skipton	Midland.
Sleaford	Great Northern.
Slough	Great Western.
Smeeth	South-Eastern.
Snaith	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Sole-street	London, Chatham, and Dover.
Southall	Great Western.
Southampton	London and South-Western.
South Stockton	North-Eastern.
Sowerby Bridge	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Spalding	Great Northern.
Stafford	London and North-Western.
Staleybridge	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Staleybridge	Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire.
Stamford	Midland.
Staplehurst	South-Eastern.
Stewart's-lane	London, Chatham, and Dover.
Steyning	London, Brighton, and South Coast.
Stirling	Caledonian

Name of Station.	Name of Railway.
Stirling	North British.
Stockton (North Shore)	North-Eastern.
Stoke	North Staffordshire.
Stone	North Staffordshire.
Stonehaven	Caledonian.
Stowmarket	Great Eastern.
Stranraer	Caledonian.
Stratford	Great Western.
Strood	South-Eastern.
Sudbury	Great Eastern.
Sunderland (Monkwearmouth).	North-Eastern.
Surbiton	London and South-Western.
Swansea	Great Western.
Swansea	Llanelly Railway and Dock.
Syston	Midland.
Tain	Highland.
Talgarth	Mid-Wales.
Taunton	Bristol and Exeter.
Tavistock	South Devon.
Tayport	North British.
Tebay	North-Eastern.
Tewkesbury	Midland.
Thame	Great Western.
Thames Haven	London, Tilbury, and Southend.
Thirsk	North-Eastern.
Tilbury	London, Tilbury, and Southend.
Tiverton	Bristol and Exeter.
Todmorden	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Totnes	South Devon.
Tottenham	Great Eastern.
Towneley	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Tredegar	Sirhowy.
Truro	Cornwall.
Tullibardine	Caledonian.
Tunbridge	South-Eastern.
Turriff	Great North of Scotland.
Tutbury	North Staffordshire.
Tweedmouth	North-Eastern.
Umberleigh	London and South-Western.
Uttoxeter	North Staffordshire.
Wakefield (Kirkgate)	Great Northern.
Wakefield (Westgate)	Midland.
Warrington	London and North-Western.
Warwick	Great Western.
Watford	London and North-Western.
Wellingborough	London and North-Western.
Wellingborough	Midland.
Welshpool	Cambrian.
West Hartlepool	North-Eastern.
Wetherby	North-Eastern.
Whitehaven	Furness.
Wigan	Lancashire and Yorkshire.
Wigan	London and North-Western.
Wigton	Maryport and Carlisle.
Wimborne	London and South-Western.
Winchester	London and South-Western.
Wisbeach	Great Eastern.
Wisbeach	Midland.
Woking	London and South-Western.
Wolverhampton	Great Western.
Wolverton	London and North-Western.
Worcester (Shrub Hill)	Great Western.
Worcester	Midland.
Wrexham	Great Western.
Wymondham	Great Eastern.
Yarm	North Eastern.
Yeovil	London and South-Western.
Yeovil Junction	London and South-Western.
York (Holgate Bridge)	North-Eastern.

THE THIRD SCHEDULE.

Schleswig and Holstein.—Declaration and Certificates.

DECLARATION.

I, *A.B.*, of , being the agent for the owners [*or* charterers] of the vessel , of , hereby solemnly and sincerely declare to the best of my knowledge and belief, that each of the cattle described below, now about to be put on board the said vessel, has been bred and fed exclusively in Denmark, Schleswig, and Holstein, or some or one of them, and has never been in contact with cattle not so exclusively bred and fed, and has not within the last three months been carried at sea on any vessel.

Dated this day of

[To be signed] *A.B.*

Description of Cattle above referred to.

	Number *
Bulls	
Oxen	
Cows	
Calves	

* Number to be expressed both in words and figures.

CERTIFICATE BY CONSULAR OFFICER.

I, *C. D.*, Vice consul [*or as the case may be*] of Her Britannic Majesty at the Port of Husum [*or as the case may be*], hereby certify that the foregoing declaration was made by the above-named *A. B.* before me, this day of , 18 , and that I know the said *A. B.*, and that he is worthy of belief.

[To be signed] *C. D.*

[and Consular Seal to be affixed.]

CERTIFICATE BY OFFICER OF ROYAL PRUSSIAN PROVINCIAL COUNCIL OFFICE.

I, *X. Y.*, hereby certify that I have this day seen the cattle above described, and that I believe the statements respecting the breeding, feeding, and carrying of each of them contained in the foregoing declaration of *A. B.*, to be true in all respects.

[To be signed] *X. Y.*,

Officer of the Royal Prussian Provincial Council Office, at the Port of Husum [*or as the case may be*].

(375.)

SOUTHAMPTON.

At the Council Chamber, Whitehall, the 5th day of June 1875.

By the Lords of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council.

THE Lords of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, by virtue and in exercise of the powers in them vested under The Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act 1869, and of every other power enabling them in this behalf, do hereby define the parts of the Port of Southampton, in the town and county of that name, within which foreign cattle may be landed for slaughter and quarantine respectively, as follows:

(1.) All that space in the borough of Southampton on the property of the Southampton Dock Company, lying between the River Itchen and a line commencing at the water of the said river at the Mooring Dolphin at the South East Quay, and following the line of the South East Quay, and skirting the boundary wall of the Open Dock across the entrances of the three Graving Docks to the turntable at the soth-west corner of the Open Dock, thence in a southerly direction for a distance of four hundred feet along the outer line of railway to the junction of the two lines of railway on the south-west sides of the said Graving Docks, and continuing along the outer line of railway to a point immediately opposite the head of the East Graving Dock, thence in an easterly direction to the water of the said River Itchen, which space is coloured pink on the plan of Southampton Docks, deposited at the Privy Council Office, a copy of which is deposited at the office of the Town Clerk of the borough of Southampton:

(2.) All that space on the property of the Southampton Dock Company, lying between the dock wall forming the southern side of the Close Dock, and a line from the south-western corner of the said dock in continuation of the said dock wall to the western boundary wall of the said property, and a line commencing at the south-eastern corner of the Close Dock, and running southward in continuation of the eastern wall of the said dock for a distance of seventy-two yards, thence in a westerly direction on the southern side of the said Dock Company's sheds on a line parallel with the said wall forming the southern side of the said dock and extending to the said western boundary wall, which space is coloured blue on the said plan and copy deposited as aforesaid; which landing-place is hereinafter referred to as (No. 2):

And do hereby prescribe as follows:

Regulation Six of the Fourth Schedule to The Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869, shall not apply to cattle landed within the landing-place (No. 2), and such cattle shall be placed in pens, sheds, or other receptacles within that landing-place properly prepared for their reception by the consignees or other persons, and approved for that purpose by the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Customs, and shall be kept therein at the sole expense of the owner or consignee, subject to the supervision and control of the said Commissioners, and in accordance with any regulations made by them, for such period, not exceeding fourteen days, as the Privy Council from time to time prescribe, and any cattle so landed and

Appendix, No. 4.

kept may be moved to any place out of the limits of the landing-place (No. 2), with a certificate of the Veterinary Inspector appointed in that behalf by the Privy Council, certifying that they are free from contagious or infectious disease; but not otherwise.

This Order shall take effect from and immediately after the twenty-third day of June, One thousand eight hundred and seventy-five.

(signed) *C. L. Peel.*

(380.)

At the Council Chamber, Whitehall, the 18th day of January 1876.

By the Lords of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council.

PRESENT:

Lord President. | Viscount Sandon.

THE Lords and others of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, by virtue and in exercise of the powers in them vested under the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869 (in this Order referred to as the Act of 1869), and of every other power enabling them in this behalf, do order, and it is hereby ordered, as follows:—

1. This Order shall take effect from and immediately after the twenty-third day of January, One thousand eight hundred and seventy-six; and words in this Order have the same meaning as in the Act of 1869.

2. The Animals Order of 1875 shall be read and have effect as if Granton and Leith were not named in Article 71 or Article 85 of that Order.

3. The Orders described in the Schedule to this Order are hereby revoked.

4. Nothing in this Order shall be deemed to invalidate or make unlawful anything done under the said Orders, or either of them, before the date when this revocation takes effect, or interfere with the institution or prosecution of any proceeding in respect of any offence committed against, or any penalty incurred under, the said Orders, or either of them.

(signed) *C. L. Peel.*

SCHEDULE.

Order of Council of 10th August 1869, defining the part of the Port of Granton, within which foreign cattle might be landed for slaughter.

Order of Council of 10th August 1869, defining the part of the Port of Leith, within which foreign cattle might be landed for slaughter.

(381.)

At the Council Chamber, Whitehall, the 6th day of April 1876.

By the Lords of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council.

PRESENT:

Lord President. | Viscount Sandon.

THE Lords and others of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, by virtue and in exercise of the powers in them vested under the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869, and of every other power enabling them in this behalf, do order, and it is hereby ordered, as follows:—

1. With respect to the places of landing for animals at the Bristol Docks, at Bristol, in the county of Gloucester, and the places adjacent thereto, the mode of the cleansing and disinfection thereof is, with reference to Articles 20 and 24 of the Animals Order of 1875, hereby prescribed, and the same shall be cleansed and disinfected in the mode following:—

(1.) By the sweeping thereof, and the effectual removal therefrom of all dung, sawdust, litter, and other matter:

(2.) Then by the thorough washing, with water, of the floors of the pens, and of the walls or fences of the pens, and of all other parts above the surface of the floors of the pens:

(3.) Then

(3.) Then by the application to the surface of the ground and floors of the pens of a mixture of water and commercial carbolic acid in the proportion of one-fifth of a pint of carbolic acid to a gallon of water:

(4.) Then by the application to the walls and fences and all other parts above the surface of the ground or floors of the pens with which animals or their droppings have come in contact, of a coating of limewash made of good freshly burnt lime and water, and containing in each gallon of limewash one-fifth of a pint of commercial carbolic acid, the limewash being prepared immediately before use.

2. The sweepings of the places of landing and places adjacent thereto shall be well mixed with quicklime, and shall be effectually removed from contact with animals.

3. This Order shall take effect from and immediately after the thirteenth day of April, One thousand eight hundred and seventy-six; and words in this Order have the same meaning as in the Animals Order of 1875.

(signed) *C. L. Peel.*

(382.)

At the Council Chamber, Whitehall, the 11th day of May 1876.

By the Lords of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council.

PRESENT:

Lord President. | Viscount Sandon.

THE Lords and others of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, by virtue and in exercise of the powers in them vested under the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869 (in this Order referred to as the Act of 1869), and of every other power enabling them in this behalf, do order, and it is hereby ordered, as follows:—

1. This Order shall take effect from and immediately after the eighteenth day of May, One thousand eight hundred and seventy-six; and words in this Order have the same meaning as in the Act of 1869.

2. The Animals Order of 1875 shall be read and have effect as if Dover, Folkestone, and Newhaven were not named in Article 63, and Dover was not named in Article 71 of that Order, and after this Order takes effect foreign animals shall not be landed at any of those ports.

3. The Order described in the Schedule to this Order is hereby revoked.

4. Nothing in this Order shall be deemed to invalidate or make unlawful anything done under the said Orders, or either of them, before the date when this Order takes effect, or interfere with the institution or prosecution of any proceeding in respect of any offence committed against, or any penalty incurred under, the said Orders, or either of them.

(signed) *C. L. Peel.*

SCHEDULE.

Order of Council of 10th August 1869, defining the part of the port of Dover, within which foreign cattle might be landed for slaughter.

(383.)

At the Council Chamber, Whitehall, the 16th day of June 1876.

By the Lords of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council.

PRESENT:

Lord President. | Viscount Sandon.

THE Lords and others of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, by virtue and in exercise of the powers in them vested under the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869 (in this Order referred to as the Act of 1869), and of every other power enabling them in this behalf, do order, and it is hereby ordered, as follows:

1. This Order shall take effect from and immediately after the eighth day of July, One thousand eight hundred and seventy-six; and words in this Order have the same meaning as in the Act of 1869.

2. This Order may be cited as the Sheep-Scab (Returns) Order of 1876.

3. Article 6 of the Animals Order of 1875 shall not apply to sheep-scab.

Appendix, No. 4.

4. Where an Inspector of a Local Authority finds sheep-scab to exist in his district, he shall forthwith make a return thereof to the Local Authority and to the Privy Council, on a form provided by the Privy Council, with all particulars therein required, and shall continue to so make a return thereof on the last day of every month, unless the last day of the month is Sunday, and then on the Saturday previous, until the disease has ceased.

(signed) *C. L. Peel.*

(384.)

At the Council Chamber, Whitehall, the 29th day of September 1876.

By the Lords of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council.

PRESENT:

Earl of Derby. | Sir John Dalrymple Hay, Bart.

THE Lords and others of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, by virtue and in exercise of the powers in them vested under the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869 (in this Order referred to as the Act of 1869), and of every other power enabling them in this behalf, do order, and it is hereby ordered, as follows:

1. This Order shall take effect from and immediately after the first day of October, One thousand eight hundred and seventy-six; and words in this Order have the same meaning as in the Act of 1869.

2. Notwithstanding anything in the Animals Order of 1875, foreign animals may be landed at the Port of Rochester.

3. All the regulations applicable to the landing of foreign animals at the ports named in Article 63 of the said Order shall apply to foreign animals landed at the Port of Rochester.

(signed) *C. L. Peel.*

(385.)

At the Council Chamber, Whitehall, the 16th day of January 1877.

By the Lords of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council.

PRESENT:

Earl of Carnarvon. | Viscount Sandon.

THE Lords and others of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, by virtue and in exercise of the powers in them vested under the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869 (in this Order referred to as the Act of 1869), and of every other power enabling them in this behalf, do order, and it is hereby ordered, as follows:

1. This Order shall take effect from and immediately after the seventeenth day of January, One thousand eight hundred and seventy-seven; and words in this Order have the same meaning as in the Act of 1869.

2. All the regulations of the Fourth Schedule to the Act of 1869 shall apply to sheep and goats brought to Great Britain from a port or place in the German Empire and landed in Great Britain, and such sheep and goats shall not be landed except at a landing-place within the respective defined parts of the following ports:—

Glasgow.	Middlesbrough.
Goole.	Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
Grimsby.	Plymouth.
Hartlepool.	Shields, North.
Hull.	Southampton.
Littlehampton.	Sunderland.
London.	

3. All such sheep and goats shall be slaughtered within ten days after the landing thereof, exclusive of the day of landing.

But this Article shall operate subject to the special provisions of the Order of Council defining parts of the Port of Southampton, dated the 5th day of June, One thousand eight hundred and seventy-five.

(signed) *C. L. Peel.*

(386.)

At the Council Chamber, Whitehall, the 18th day of January 1877.

By the Lords of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council.

PRESENT:

Earl of Carnarvon. | Viscount Sandon.

THE Lords and others of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, by virtue and in exercise of the powers in them vested under the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869 (in this Order referred to as the Act of 1869), and of every other power enabling them in this behalf, do order, and it is hereby ordered, as follows:—

1. This Order shall take effect from and immediately after this eighteenth day of January, One thousand eight hundred and seventy-seven; and words in this Order have the same meaning as in the Act of 1869.

2. All the regulations of the Fourth Schedule to the Act of 1869 shall apply to sheep and goats brought to Great Britain from a port or place in Belgium or France and landed in Great Britain, and such sheep and goats shall not be landed except at a landing-place within the respective defined parts of the following ports:—

Glasgow.	Middlesbrough.
Goole.	Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
Grimsby.	Plymouth.
Hartlepool.	Shields, North.
Hull.	Southampton.
Littlehampton.	Sunderland.
London.	

3. All such sheep and goats shall be slaughtered within ten days after the landing thereof, exclusive of the day of landing.

But this Article shall operate subject to the special provisions of the Order of Council defining parts of the Port of Southampton, dated the fifth day of June, One thousand eight hundred and seventy-five.

(signed) *C. L. Peel.*

(387.)

At the Council Chamber, Whitehall, the 27th day of January 1877.

By the Lords of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council.

PRESENT:

Lord Chancellor. | Viscount Sandon.

THE Lords and others of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, by virtue and in exercise of the powers in them vested under the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869 (in this Order referred to as the Act of 1869), and of every other power enabling them in this behalf, do order, and it is hereby ordered, as follows:—

1. This Order shall take effect from and immediately after the twenty-ninth day of January, One thousand eight hundred and seventy-seven; and words in this Order have the same meaning as in the Act of 1869.

2. Cattle brought from a port or place in Belgium or the German Empire, and cattle, sheep, or goats being or having been on board a vessel at the same time with cattle so brought, shall not be landed in Great Britain.

3. The following articles brought from a port or place in Belgium or the German Empire shall not be landed in Great Britain:—

Fat; hay (not being hay used in the packing of merchandise); fresh hides; hoofs; horns; manure (not being artificial manure); fresh meat.

(signed) *C. L. Peel.*

Appendix, No. 4.

(388.)

At the Council Chamber, Whitehall, the 31st day of January 1877.

By the Lords of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council.

PRESENT:

Lord President. | Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.

WHEREAS the cattle plague or rinderpest has appeared in the metropolis:

Now, therefore, the Lords and others of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, by virtue and in exercise of the powers in them vested under the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869 (in this Order referred to as the Act of 1869), and of every other power enabling them in this behalf, do order, and it is hereby ordered, as follows:

1. This Order shall take effect from and immediately after this thirty-first day of January, One thousand eight hundred and seventy-seven; and words in this Order have the same meaning as in the Act of 1869.

2. This Order may be cited as the Metropolitan Cattle Plague Order of 1877.

3. This Order relates to the metropolis only; and the provisions thereof are supplemental to, and not in substitution of, those of the Animals Order of 1875.

4. No cattle, sheep, or goats shall be moved out of the metropolis.

(signed) *Edmund Harrison.*

(389.)

At the Council Chamber, Whitehall, the 2nd day of February 1877.

By the Lords of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council.

PRESENT:

Lord President. | Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.

THE Lords and others of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, by virtue and in exercise of the powers in them vested under the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869 (in this Order referred to as the Act of 1869), and of every other power enabling them in this behalf, do order, and it is hereby ordered, as follows:

1. The holding of all markets or sales of cattle, sheep, or goats within the metropolis is hereby prohibited, except as follows:

(1.) Cattle, sheep, or goats belonging to the owner or occupier of premises not in an infected place may be sold on those premises, if the cattle, sheep, or goats are not affected with cattle-plague, and have been on those premises in possession of the owner or occupier thereof not less than 28 days immediately before the sale:

(2.) Markets and sales may be held under license of the Privy Council.

If any cattle, sheep, or goats are sold, or exposed or put up for sale, in contravention of this Article, the seller and the purchaser thereof, and the auctioneer putting the same up for sale, or the person exposing the same for sale, shall each be deemed guilty of an offence against this Order; and if any person holds a market, or sale, in contravention of this Article, or fails to comply with any of the conditions, provisions, or regulations of any license for the holding of a market or sale, he shall be deemed guilty of an offence against this Order.

2. Cattle, sheep, or goats exposed for sale in a market the holding whereof for the sale of cattle, sheep, or goats for immediate slaughter is licensed by the Privy Council, may be kept alive for a period of 10 days after such exposure, and no longer.

If any person keeps any cattle, sheep, or goats alive in contravention of this Article, he shall be deemed guilty of an offence against this Order.

3. The owner, consignee, or other person exposing in a market the holding whereof for the sale of cattle, sheep, or goats for immediate slaughter is licensed by the Privy Council, any cattle, sheep, or goats shall, at his own expense, mark them as follows:

Cattle.—By clipping the hair off the end of the tail, and by clipping a broad arrow, about five inches long, on the left quarter.

Sheep and Goats.—By clipping a broad arrow, about four inches long, on the forehead.

If any person fails to comply with the provisions of this Article, he shall be deemed guilty of an offence against this Order.

4. This Order shall take effect from and immediately after the fourth day of February, One thousand eight hundred and seventy-seven; and words in this Order have the same meaning as in the Act of 1869; and the provisions thereof are supplemental to, and not in substitution of, those of the Animals Order of 1875.

(signed) *C. L. Peel.*

(390.)

At the Council Chamber, Whitehall, the 8th day of February 1877.

By the Lords of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council.

PRESENT:

Lord President. | Viscount Sandon.

The Lords and others of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, by virtue and in exercise of the powers in them vested under the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869 (in this Order referred to as the Act of 1869), and of every other power enabling them in this behalf, do order, and it is hereby ordered, as follows:

1. This Order shall take effect from and immediately after the tenth day of February, One thousand eight hundred and seventy-seven; and words in this Order have the same meaning as in the Act of 1869.

2. All the regulations of the Fourth Schedule to the Act of 1869 shall apply to cattle, sheep, and goats brought to Great Britain from a port or place in the Netherlands and landed in Great Britain, and such cattle, sheep, and goats shall not be landed except at a landing-place within the respective defined parts of the following ports:

Glasgow.	Middlesbrough.
Goole.	Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
Grimsby.	Plymouth.
Hartlepool.	Shields, North.
Hull.	Southampton.
Littlehampton.	Sunderland.
London.	

3. All such cattle, sheep, and goats shall be slaughtered within 10 days after the landing thereof, exclusive of the day of landing.

But this Article shall operate subject to the special provisions of the Order of Council defining parts of the Port of Southampton, dated the fifth day of June, One thousand eight hundred and seventy-five.

(signed) *C. L. Peel.*

(391.)

At the Council Chamber, Whitehall, the 9th day of February 1877.

By the Lords of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council.

The Lords of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, by virtue and in exercise of the powers in them vested under the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869, and of every other power enabling them in this behalf, do hereby declare the following place to be free from cattle-plague (that is to say):

So much of the Foreign Cattle Market at Deptford, in the county of Kent, as was declared by the Local Authority on the seventeenth day of January, One thousand eight hundred and seventy-seven, to be an infected place:

And do order that as from the date of this Order the same shall cease to be an infected place within the meaning of the said Act accordingly.

(signed) *C. L. Peel.*

(392.)

At the Council Chamber, Whitehall, the 13th day of February 1877.

By the Lords of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council.

PRESENT:

Lord President. | Mr. Secretary Cross.

Whereas the cattle plague, or rinderpest, has appeared beyond the limits of the metropolis:

Now, therefore, the Lords and others of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, by virtue and in exercise of the powers in them vested under the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869 (in this Order referred to as the Act of 1869), and of every other power enabling them in this behalf, do order, and it is hereby ordered, as follows:

 1. This

Appendix, No. 4.

1. This Order shall take effect from and immediately after this thirteenth day of February, One thousand eight hundred and seventy-seven; and words in this Order have the same meaning as in the Animals Order of 1875.

2. This Order may be cited as the Cattle Plague Order of 1877.

3. This Order extends to Great Britain only.

4. The provisions of this Order are supplemental to and not in substitution of those of the Animals Order of 1875, and of the Metropolitan Cattle Plague Order of 1877.

5. A Local Authority may from time to time, with the view of preventing the introduction or the spreading of cattle-plague within their district, make regulations for the following purposes, or any of them:

(1.) For prohibiting the holding of markets, fairs, exhibitions, or sales of cattle within their district, except as follows:

a. Cattle belonging to the owner or occupier of premises not in an infected place may be sold on those premises if the cattle are not affected with cattle-plague, and have been on those premises in possession of the owner or occupier thereof not less than 28 days immediately before the sale.

b. Cattle within a defined part of a port, which have been delivered to the owner or his agent, may be sold within such defined part.

c. Markets, exhibitions, and sales of cattle may be held under license of the Privy Council.

(2.) For prohibiting or regulating the movement into their district of cattle from the district of any other Local Authority, and for prohibiting or regulating the movement of cattle within their district: provided that any such prohibition or regulation shall not restrict the moving of any cattle by railway through or out of their district.

If any cattle are sold, or exposed or put up for sale, or exhibited in contravention of this Article, or of a regulation made by a Local Authority thereunder, the seller thereof, and the auctioneer putting the same up for sale, or the person exposing the same for sale, or exhibiting the same, shall each be deemed guilty of an offence against this Order; and if any person holds a market, exhibition, or sale in contravention of this Article, or of a regulation made by a Local Authority thereunder, or fails to comply with any of the conditions, provisions, or regulations of any license for the holding of a market, exhibition, or sale, he shall be deemed guilty of an offence against this Order; and if any cattle are moved in contravention of a regulation made by a Local Authority under this Article, the owner thereof, and the person directing or permitting their removal, and the company or person removing or conveying them, shall each be deemed guilty of an offence against this Order.

6. Cattle exposed for sale in a market, the holding whereof for the sale of cattle for immediate slaughter is licensed by the Privy Council, may be kept alive for a period of 10 days after such exposure, and no longer.

If any person keeps any cattle alive in contravention of this Article, he shall be deemed guilty of an offence against this Order.

7. The owner, consignee, or other person exposing any cattle in a market the holding whereof for the sale of cattle for immediate slaughter is licensed by the Privy Council, shall, at his own expense, mark them as follows:

By clipping the hair off the end of the tail, and by clipping a broad arrow, about five inches long, on the left quarter.

If any person fails to comply with the provisions of this Article, he shall be deemed guilty of an offence against this Order.

(signed) *C. L. Peel.*

(393.)

At the Council Chamber, Whitehall, the 20th day of February 1877.

By the Lords of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council.

PRESENT:

Lord President. | Viscount Sandon.

The Lords and others of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, by virtue and in exercise of the powers in them vested under the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869 (in this Order referred to as the Act of 1869), and of every other power enabling them in this behalf, do order, and it is hereby ordered, as follows:

1. This Order shall take effect from and immediately after the twentieth day of February, One thousand eight hundred and seventy-seven, and shall cease to have effect from and immediately after the thirty-first day of May, One thousand eight hundred and seventy-seven; and words in this Order have the same meaning as in the Animals Order of 1875.

2. Notwithstanding

2. Notwithstanding anything in the Cattle Plague Order of 1877, or in any other Order of Council, the holding of markets, fairs, exhibitions, or sales of cattle within the East Riding of Yorkshire, and within the boroughs of Beverley, Hedon, Kingston-upon-Hull, and York, is hereby prohibited, except as follows:

a. Cattle belonging to the owner or occupier of premises not in an infected place may be sold on those premises if the cattle are not affected with cattle-plague, and have been on those premises in possession of the owner or occupier thereof not less than 28 days immediately before the sale.

b. Cattle within a defined part of a port, which have been delivered to the owner or his agent, may be sold within such defined part.

c. Markets, exhibitions, and sales of cattle may be held under license of the Privy Council.

The movement of cattle within the East Riding of Yorkshire, and within the boroughs of Beverley, Hedon, Kingston-upon-Hull, and York, is hereby prohibited, except with a license prescribed in that behalf by the Local Authority of the district where such cattle are: Provided as follows:

(1.) No cattle shall be moved out of the district in which they are, except with a license of the Local Authority; and if that license is not signed by a justice of the peace, then there shall also be requisite a license of the Local Authority of the district into which they are to be moved, indorsed on or referring to such first-mentioned license; but such secondly-mentioned license shall not be necessary in the case of movement from lands to other lands in the same occupation, situate in the district into which the cattle are moved, within 500 yards of the boundary of the district out of which they are moved: provided that no license for movement shall be available for movement into the district of any Local Authority, if such Local Authority have made a regulation wholly prohibiting such movement.

(2.) No license shall be necessary for movement within the district for a distance not exceeding 500 yards from lands to other lands in the same occupation.

3. If any cattle are sold, or exposed or put up for sale, or exhibited in contravention of this Order, the seller thereof, and the auctioneer putting the same up for sale, or the person exposing the same for sale or exhibiting the same, shall each be deemed guilty of an offence against this Order; and if any person holds a market, exhibition, or sale in contravention of this Order, or fails to comply with any of the conditions, provisions, or regulations of any license for the holding of a market, exhibition, or sale, he shall be deemed guilty of an offence against this Order; and if any cattle are moved in contravention of the provisions of this Order, the owner thereof, and the person directing or permitting their removal, and the company or person removing or conveying them, shall each be deemed guilty of an offence against this Order.

4. Cattle exposed for sale in a market the holding whereof for the sale of cattle for immediate slaughter is licensed by the Privy Council, may be kept alive for a period of 10 days after such exposure, and no longer.

If any person keeps any cattle alive in contravention of this Article, he shall be deemed guilty of an offence against this Order.

5. The owner, consignee, or other person exposing any cattle in a market the holding whereof for the sale of cattle for immediate slaughter is licensed by the Privy Council, shall, at his own expense, mark them as follows:

By clipping the hair off the end of the tail, and by clipping a broad arrow, about five inches long, on the left quarter.

If any person fails to comply with the provisions of this Article, he shall be deemed guilty of an offence against this Order.

(signed) *C. L. Peel.*

(394.)

At the Council Chamber, Whitehall, the 6th day of March 1877.

By the Lords of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council.

PRESENT:

Lord President. | Viscount Sandon.

THE Lords and others of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, by virtue and in exercise of the powers in them vested under the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869, and of every other power enabling them in this behalf, do order, and it is hereby ordered, as follows:

Appendix, No. 4.

1. This Order shall take effect from and immediately after this sixth day of March, one thousand eight hundred and seventy-seven, and words in this Order have the same meaning as in the Animals Order of 1875.

2. Notwithstanding anything in the Cattle Plague Order of 1877, or in any other Order of Council, the holding of markets, fairs, exhibitions, or sales of cattle within the Parts of Holland, the Parts of Kesteven, and the Parts of Lindsey, Lincolnshire, and within the boroughs of Boston, Grantham, Grimsby, Lincoln, Louth, and Stamford, is hereby prohibited, except as follows:

a. Cattle belonging to the owner or occupier of premises not in an infected place may be sold on those premises if the cattle are not affected with cattle-plague, and have been on those premises in possession of the owner or occupier thereof not less than 28 days immediately before the sale.

b. Cattle within a defined part of a port, which have been delivered to the owne or his agent, may be sold within such defined part.

c. Markets, exhibitions, and sales of cattle may be held under license of the Privy Council.

If any cattle are sold, or exposed, or put up for sale, or exhibited in contravention of this Article, the seller thereof, and the auctioneer putting the same up for sale, or the person exposing the same for sale, or exhibiting the same, shall each be deemed guilty of an offence against this Order; and if any person holds a market, exhibition, or sale in contravention of this Article, or fails to comply with any of the conditions, provisions, or regulations of any license for the holding of a market, exhibition, or sale, he shall be deemed guilty of an offence against this Order.

3. Cattle exposed for sale in a market the holding whereof for the sale of cattle for immediate slaughter is licensed by the Privy Council, may be kept alive for a period of 10 days after such exposure, and no longer.

If any person keeps any cattle alive in contravention of this Article, he shall be deemed guilty of an offence against this Order.

4. The owner, consignee, or other person exposing any cattle in a market the holding whereof for the sale of cattle for immediate slaughter is licensed by the Privy Council, shall, at his own expense, mark them as follows:

By clipping the hair off the end of the tail, and by clipping a broad arrow, about five inches long, on the left quarter.

If any person fails to comply with the provisions of this Article, he shall be deemed guilty of an offence against this Order.

(signed) *C. L. Peel.*

(395.)

At the Council Chamber, Whitehall, the 8th day of March 1877.

By the Lords of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council.

PRESENT:

Lord President. | Viscount Sandon.

THE Lords and others of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, by virtue and in exercise of the powers in them vested under the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869 (in this Order referred to as the Act of 1869), and of every other power enabling them in this behalf, do order, and it is hereby ordered, as follows:

Every Local Authority shall keep, in the form given in the Schedule to this Order, or a form to the like effect, a record relative to proceedings, under Part V. of the Act of 1869, stating the particulars indicated in the form given in the said Schedule, with such variations as circumstances require; and every Local Authority shall keep the record in such manner, and shall furnish to the Privy Council such copies thereof, or extracts therefrom, as the Privy Council from time to time require.

(signed) *C. L. Peel.*

SCHEDULE.

Form of Record.

THE CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) ACT, 1869.

County [or Borough or Burgh] of _____

CATTLE-PLAGUE RECORD.

PART I.

RECORD of each Animal affected with Cattle Plague Slaughtered in pursuance of Section 65 (or reserved for Experimental Treatment under Section 73) of the above-mentioned Act.

Date of the Order for Slaughter by the Local Authority.	Date of the Execution of the Order.	Name of Premises on which the Animal was Slaughtered, and of the Parish in which situated.	Name and Address of the Owner of the Animal.	Description of the Animal Slaughtered, whether Bull, Cow, Ox, Heifer, or Calf, Sheep, Goat, &c.	Value of the Animal immediately before it was Affected.	Date of Valuation.	Name and Address of the Valuator.	Number of Animals Valued.	Amount of Valuation per Head.	Number Slaughtered.	Number died since Valuation.	Witness to the Slaughtering.	Amount of Compensation to Owner per Head.	Total Amount of Compensation paid by the Local Authority to the Owner.
					£. s. d.				£. s. d.				£. s. d.	£. s. d.

Of the above animals the following were reserved for experimental treatment by direction of the Privy Council, dated _____

REMARKS.

PART II.

RECORD of each Animal that, having been in the same Shed or Stable, or in the same Herd or Flock, or in contact with any Animal affected with Cattle Plague, has been Slaughtered under Section 66 of the above-mentioned Act.

Date of the Order for Slaughter by the Local Authority.	Date of the Execution of the Order.	Name of Premises on which the Animal was Slaughtered, and of the Parish in which situated.	Name and Address of the Owner of the Animal.	Description of the Animal Slaughtered, whether Bull, Cow, Ox, Heifer, or Calf, Sheep, Goat, &c.	Value of the Animal Slaughtered.	Date of Valuation.	Name and Address of the Valuator.	Number of Animals Valued.	Amount of Valuation per Head.	Number Slaughtered	Witness to the Slaughtering.	Amount of Compensation to Owner per Head.	Total Amount of Compensation paid by the Local Authority to the Owner.
					£. s. d.				£. s. d.			£. s. d.	£. s. d.

REMARKS.

PART III.

RECORD of each Animal that, being affected with Disease suspected to be Cattle Plague, has been Slaughtered, under Section 67 of the above-mentioned Act.

Date of the Order for Slaughter by the Local Authority.	Date of the Execution of the Order.	Name of Premises on which the Animal was Slaughtered, and of the Parish in which situated.	Name and Address of the Owner of the Animal.	Description of the Animal Slaughtered, whether Bull, Cow, Ox, Heifer or Calf, Sheep, Goat, &c.	Value of the Animal immediately before it was Affected.	Date of Valuation.	Name and Address of the Valuator.	Number of Animals Valued.	Amount of Valuation per Head.	Number Slaughtered.	Number died since Valuation.	Witness to the Slaughtering.	Amount of Compensation to Owner per Head.	Total Amount of Compensation paid by the Local Authority to the Owner.
					£. s. d.				£. s. d.				£. s. d.	£. s. d.

REMARKS.

(396.)

At the Council Chamber, Whitehall, the 12th day of March 1877.

By the Lords of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council.

PRESENT:

Lord President. | Viscount Sandon.

THE Lords and others of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, by virtue and in exercise of the powers in them vested under the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869, and of every other power enabling them in this behalf, do order, and it is hereby ordered, as follows:

1. This Order shall take effect from and immediately after this twelfth day of March, One thousand eight hundred and seventy-seven; and words in this Order have the same meaning as in the Animals Order of 1875.

2. Notwithstanding anything in the Cattle Plague Order of 1877, or in any other Order of Council, the movement of cattle within the Parts of Holland, the Parts of Kesteven, and the Parts of Lindsey, Lincolnshire, and within the boroughs of Boston, Grantham, Grimsby, Lincoln, Louth, and Stamford, is hereby prohibited, except with a license prescribed in that behalf by the Local Authority of the district where such cattle are: Provided as follows:

(1.) No cattle shall be moved out of the district in which they are, except with a license of the Local Authority; and if that license is not signed by a justice of the peace, then there shall also be requisite a license of the Local Authority of the district into which they are to be moved, indorsed on or referring to such first-mentioned license; but such secondly-mentioned license shall not be necessary in the case of movement from lands to other lands in the same occupation, situate in the district into which the cattle are moved, within five hundred yards of the boundary of the district out of which they are moved: provided that no license for movement shall be available for movement into the district of any Local Authority, if such Local Authority have made a regulation wholly prohibiting such movement.

(2.) No license shall be necessary for movement within the district for a distance not exceeding five hundred yards from lands to other lands in the same occupation.

3. If any cattle are moved in contravention of the provisions of this Order, the owner thereof, and the person directing or permitting their removal, and the company or person removing or conveying them, shall each be deemed guilty of an offence against this Order.

(signed) *C. L. Peel*

(397.)

At the Council Chamber, Whitehall, the 12th day of April 1877.

By the Lords of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council.

PRESENT:

Lord President. | Viscount Sandon.

THE Lords and others of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, by virtue and in exercise of the powers in them vested under the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869, (in this Order referred to as the Act of 1869), and of every other power enabling them in this behalf, do order, and it is hereby ordered, as follows:

1. This Order shall take effect from and immediately after the fifteenth day of April, One thousand eight hundred and seventy-seven; and words in this Order have the same meaning as in the Animals Order of 1875.

2. This Order extends to the City of London and the Metropolitan Police District only.

3. Every person having in his possession or under his charge an animal affected with cattle-plague, or with disease suspected to be cattle-plague, shall observe the following rules:—

(1.) He shall, as far as practicable, keep that animal separate from animals not so affected:

(2.) He

Appendix, No. 4.

(2.) He shall, with all practicable speed, give notice of the fact of the animal being so affected to a constable of the police establishment for the place where the animal is.

The constable shall forthwith give notice thereof to the Clerk of the Council at the Veterinary Department.

4. No animal (including a dog) shall be moved alive out of a building or enclosed space in which cattle-plague exists, or has existed, within seven days.

5. Where an Inspector of the Privy Council affixes at or near the entrance to a building or enclosed place in or on which cattle are kept, and wherein cattle-plague exists, or has existed within seven days, a notice forbidding persons to enter into or on that building or place without his permission, then, if any person not having a right of entry or way into, on, or over that building or place, enters into, on, or over the same, or any part thereof, in contravention of the notice, he shall be deemed guilty of an offence against this Order, and shall, for every such offence, be liable to a penalty not exceeding five pounds.

6. Every person having been in a building or enclosed place in which cattle-plague exists or has existed within seven days shall, before leaving that building or enclosed place, disinfect his clothes to the satisfaction of the Inspector of the Privy Council, or other officer acting on his behalf.

7. The carcase of an animal that has died of cattle-plague, or has been slaughtered in consequence of being affected with cattle-plague, shall not be moved out of a building or enclosed place in which it has so died or been slaughtered, except in a van exclusively set apart and used for the purpose of conveying such carcases; and every such van shall, immediately after each occasion of use, be cleansed and disinfected in manner provided by Article 18 of the Animals Order of 1875.

8. All milk-cans, churns, pails, tools, and appliances, and other apparatus, used for or about animals, in a building or enclosed place in which cattle-plague exists, or has existed within seven days, shall be cleansed and disinfected as often, and in such manner, as an Inspector of the Privy Council directs or approves.

9. Every building or enclosed place in which an animal affected with cattle-plague has been kept while so affected, or has died of cattle-plague, or been slaughtered in consequence of being affected with cattle-plague, shall be thoroughly cleansed and disinfected under the direction of an Inspector of the Privy Council.

10. The provisions of this Order apply to all places being infected places at the time when this Order takes effect.

11. Nothing in this Order shall relieve any Local Authority affected by this Order, or any of their officers, from the obligation to carry into effect the provisions of the Act of 1869, and the Orders of Council thereunder with respect to diseases other than cattle-plague.

12. Article 7 of the Animals Order of 1875 shall be deemed to be omitted from that Order, and that Order shall be read and have effect as if the following article was therein substituted:

> Any dung, and any hay, straw, litter, or other thing commonly used for food of animals, or otherwise for or about animals, may be moved out of an infected place, with a license, signed by an Inspector of the Privy Council, certifying that the thing moved has been disinfected, but not otherwise; and shall only be so moved, in any case, for the purpose of being buried or destroyed.

13. If any person fails to give, produce, do, or observe any notice, license, thing, or rule which he is by this Order required to give, produce, do, or observe, he shall be deemed guilty of an offence against this Order.

14. If any animal (including a dog) or anything is moved or dealt with in contravention of this Order, the owner thereof, and the person directing or permitting the moving thereof, or dealing therewith, and the person or company having charge of or removing or conveying the same, shall each be deemed guilty of an offence against this Order.

(signed) *C. L. Peel.*

(400.)

At the Council Chamber, Whitehall, the 27th day of April 1877.

By the Lords of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council.

PRESENT:

Lord President. | Viscount Sandon.

The Lords and others of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, by virtue and in exercise of the powers in them vested under the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869

1869 (in this Order referred to as the Act of 1869), and of every other power enabling them in this behalf, do order, and it is hereby ordered, as follows:

1. Article 12 of the Order of the Privy Council bearing date the twelfth day of April, One thousand eight hundred and seventy-seven, is hereby revoked, but not so as to revive Article 7 of the Animals Order of 1875.

2. This Order shall be read and have effect as one Order with the Animals Order of 1875.

3. Rules 4 and 5 of Part I. of the Sixth Schedule to the Act of 1869 shall not apply to an infected place within the metropolis.

4. No animal shall be moved alive out of a building or shed in the metropolis in which cattle-plague exists, or has within 28 days before the time of intended movement existed.

5. An animal may be moved alive within an infected place in the metropolis as follows, but not otherwise:

With a license signed by an Inspector of the Privy Council, certifying that the animal moved has not been in contact with an animal affected with cattle-plague, or in a building or shed in which cattle-plague exists, or has within 28 days before the date of the license existed; and in that case the animal moved shall only be so moved for the purpose of being immediately slaughtered.

6. The carcase of an animal which has died of cattle-plague, or been slaughtered in consequence of being affected with cattle-plague, may be moved out of an infected place in the metropolis as follows, but not otherwise:

With a license signed by an Inspector of the Privy Council, certifying that the carcase has been disinfected; and in that case the carcase moved shall not be moved out of the metropolis, and shall be buried or destroyed within the metropolis.

7. Any dung of animals (including horses) or any manure may be moved out of an infected place in the metropolis as follows, but not otherwise:

(1.) With a license signed by an Inspector of the Privy Council, certifying that the dung or manure moved has not been in a building or shed in which cattle-plague exists, or has within 28 days before the date of the license existed; or

(2.) With a license signed by an Inspector of the Privy Council, certifying that the dung or manure moved has been disinfected; and in that case the dung or manure moved shall be buried, burnt, or otherwise destroyed at a place to be specified in the license, in accordance with Section 61 of the Act of 1869.

8. Any hay, straw, fodder, or other thing commonly used for food of animals, may be moved out of an infected place in the metropolis as follows, but not otherwise:

(1.) With a license signed by an Inspector of the Privy Council, certifying that the thing moved has not been in a building or shed in which cattle-plague exists, or has within 28 days before the date of the license existed; or

(2.) With a license signed by an Inspector of the Privy Council, certifying that the thing moved has been disinfected; and in that case the thing moved shall not be moved out of the metropolis, and shall be buried, burnt, or otherwise destroyed within the metropolis, at a place to be specified in the license, in accordance with Section 61 of the Act of 1869.

(signed) *C. L. Peel.*

(401.)

At the Council Chamber, Whitehall, the 27th day of April 1877.

By the Lords of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council.

PRESENT:

Lord President. | Viscount Sandon.

THE Lords and others of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, by virtue and in exercise of the powers in them vested under the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869 (in this Order referred to as the Act of 1869), and of every other power enabling them in this behalf, do order, and it is hereby ordered, as follows:

1. This Order shall take effect from and immediately after the first day of May, One thousand eight hundred and seventy-seven, and shall cease to have effect from and immediately after the first day of June, One thousand eight hundred and seventy-seven; and words in this Order have the same meaning as in the Act of 1869. And the county of Middlesex means that county, except so much thereof as is in the metropolis.

2. Notwithstanding anything in the Cattle Plague Order of 1877, or in any other Order

Appendix, No. 4.

of Council, the movement of cattle, sheep, and goats out of the county of Middlesex is hereby prohibited, except as follows:

Cattle, sheep, and goats may be moved for immediate slaughter out of the county of Middlesex to the Metropolitan Cattle Market at Islington, or to a slaughter-house within the metropolis, with a license of an Inspector of the Local Authority of the county of Middlesex authorised to issue the same; and such license shall be available for twelve hours, and no longer, and shall specify the slaughter-house to which such cattle, sheep, and goats may be taken for slaughter.

The movement of cattle within the county of Middlesex is hereby prohibited, except as follows:

Cattle may be moved for immediate slaughter to a slaughter-house within the county of Middlesex, with a license of an Inspector of the Local Authority authorised to issue the same, and such license shall be available for 12 hours, and no longer, and the license shall specify the slaughter-house to which they may be taken for slaughter, and they shall not be taken elsewhere:

Provided that no license shall be necessary in the case of movement of cattle for a distance not exceeding five hundred yards from lands to other lands in the same occupation within the county of Middlesex.

3. Nothing in this Order shall restrict the moving of any cattle, sheep, or goats by railway through the county of Middlesex, or affect the operation of the provisions of the Metropolitan Cattle Plague Order of 1877.

4. If any cattle, sheep, or goats are moved in contravention of the provisions of this Order, the owner thereof, and the person directing or permitting their removal, and the company or person removing or conveying them, shall each be deemed guilty of an offence against this Order.

(signed) *C. L. Peel.*

(402.)

At the Council Chamber, Whitehall, the 27th day of April 1877.

By the Lords of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council.

PRESENT:

Lord President. | Viscount Sandon.

The Lords and others of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, by virtue and in exercise of the powers in them vested under the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869 (in this Order referred to as the Act of 1869), and of every other power enabling them in this behalf, do order, and it is hereby ordered, as follows:

1. This Order shall take effect from and immediately after the first day of May, One thousand eight hundred and seventy-seven, and shall cease to have effect from and immediately after the first day of June, One thousand eight hundred and seventy-seven; and words in this Order have the same meaning as in the Act of 1869.

2. Notwithstanding anything in the Cattle Plague Order of 1877, or in any other Order of Council, the movement of cattle within the metropolis is hereby prohibited, except as follows:

Cattle may be moved for immediate slaughter to the Metropolitan Cattle Market at Islington, or to a slaughter-house within the metropolis, with a license of an Inspector of the Local Authority authorised to issue the same, and such license shall be available for twelve hours and no longer; and in the case of cattle moved to a slaughter-house, the license shall specify the slaughter-house to which they may be taken for slaughter, and they shall not be taken elsewhere:

Provided that no license shall be necessary in the case of movement of cattle for a distance not exceeding five hundred yards from lands to other lands in the same occupation within the metropolis.

3. Cattle exposed for sale at the Metropolitan Cattle Market at Islington shall not be moved out of the limits of the area of such market, but shall be slaughtered within those limits.

4. Nothing in this Order shall affect the operation of the provisions of the Metropolitan Cattle Plague Order of 1877, or of the Order of the Privy Council dated the second day of February, One thousand eight hundred and seventy-seven.

5. If any cattle are moved in contravention of the provisions of this Order, the owner thereof, and the person directing or permitting their removal, and the company or person removing or conveying them, shall each be deemed guilty of an offence against this Order.

(signed) *C. L. Peel.*

(406.)

At the Council Chamber, Whitehall, the 4th day of May 1877.

By the Lords of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council.

PRESENT:

Lord President. | Viscount Sandon.

THE Lords and others of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, by virtue and in exercise of the powers in them vested under the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869 (in this Order referred to as the Act of 1869), and of every other power enabling them in this behalf, do order, and it is hereby ordered, as follows:—

1. This Order shall take effect from and immediately after the tenth day of May, One thousand eight hundred and seventy-seven; and words in this Order have the same meaning as in the Act of 1869.

2. The Animals Order of 1875 shall be read and have effect as if Barrow-in-Furness, Bristol, Cardiff, Dartmouth, Grangemouth, Littlehampton, Penzance, North Shields, and Shoreham were not named in Article 63, and Glasgow, Littlehampton, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, and North Shields were not named in Article 71, of that Order.

3. The Orders described in the Schedule to this Order are hereby revoked.

4. Nothing in this Order shall be deemed to invalidate or make unlawful anything done under the said Orders, or any of them, before the date when this Order takes effect, or interfere with the institution or prosecution of any proceeding in respect of any offence committed against, or any penalty incurred under, the said Orders, or any of them.

(signed) *C. L. Peel.*

SCHEDULE.

Orders of Council revoked.

Date.	Subject.
1869:	
10 August - -	Defining the part of the Port of North Shields, within which foreign cattle might be landed for slaughter.
10 August - -	Defining the part of the Port of Littlehampton, within which foreign cattle might be landed for slaughter.
28 September -	Defining a further part of the Port of North Shields, within which foreign cattle might be landed for slaughter.
1870:	
12 January - -	Defining the part of the Port of Glasgow, within which foreign cattle might be landed for slaughter.
1875:	
9 August - -	Defining the part of the Port of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, within which foreign cattle might be landed for slaughter.

(407.)

At the Council Chamber, Whitehall, the 9th day of May 1877.

By the Lords of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council

PRESENT:

Lord President. | Viscount Sandon.

THE Lords and others of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, by virtue and in exercise of the powers in them vested under the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869,

Appendix, No. 4.

1869, and of every other power enabling them in this behalf, do order, and it is hereby ordered, as follows:

1. This Order extends to the City of London and to the Metropolitan Police District only.

2. The Veterinary Department of the Privy Council Office shall slaughter every animal that is affected with cattle-plague, and may slaughter any animal that has been in contact with any animal so affected.

3. The Local Authority shall pay compensation for animals so slaughtered.

4. Words in this Order have the same meaning as in the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869.

(signed) *C. L. Peel.*

(409.)

At the Council Chamber, Whitehall, the 29th day of May 1877.

By the Lords of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council.

PRESENT:

Earl of Carnarvon. | Mr. Sclater-Booth.

THE Lords and others of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, by virtue and in exercise of the powers in them vested under the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869 (in this Order referred to as the Act of 1869), and of every other power enabling them in this behalf, do order, and it is hereby ordered, as follows:—

1. This Order shall take effect from and immediately after the thirty-first day of May, One thousand eight hundred and seventy-seven; and words in this Order have the same meaning as in the Act of 1869.

2. The Orders described in the Schedule to this Order are hereby revoked.

3. Nothing in this Order shall be deemed to invalidate or make unlawful anything done under the said Orders, or either of them, before the date when this revocation takes effect, or interfere with the institution or prosecution of any proceeding in respect of any offence committed against, or any penalty incurred under, the said orders, or either of them.

(signed) *C. L. Peel.*

SCHEDULE.

Order of Council of 6th March 1877, relating to the holding of markets, fairs, exhibitions, or sales of cattle within the Parts of Holland, the Parts of Kesteven, and the Parts of Lindsey, Lincolnshire, and within the boroughs of Boston, Grantham, Grimsby, Lincoln, Louth, and Stamford.

Order of Council of 12th March 1877, relating to the movement of cattle within the Parts of Holland, the Parts of Kesteven, and the Parts of Lindsey, Lincolnshire, and within the boroughs of Boston, Grantham, Grimsby, Lincoln, Louth, and Stamford.

(410.)

At the Council Chamber, Whitehall, the 31st day of May 1877.

By the Lords of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council.

PRESENT:

Mr. Secretary Cross. | Mr. Sclater-Booth.

THE Lords and others of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, by virtue and in exercise of the powers in them vested under the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869 (in this Order referred to as the Act of 1869), and of every other power enabling them in this behalf, do order, and it is hereby ordered, as follows:

1. This Order shall take effect from and immediately after the first day of June, One thousand

thousand eight hundred and seventy-seven, and shall cease to have effect from and immediately after the thirtieth day of June, One thousand eight hundred and seventy-seven; and words in this Order have the same meaning as in the Act of 1869, and the county of Middlesex means that county, except so much thereof as is in the metropolis.

2. Notwithstanding anything in the Cattle Plague Order of 1877, or in any other Order of Council, the movement of cattle, sheep, and goats out of the county of Middlesex is hereby prohibited, except into the metropolis.

3. Nothing in this Order shall restrict the moving of any cattle, sheep, or goats by railway through the county of Middlesex, or affect the operation of the provisions of the Metropolitan Cattle Plague Order of 1877.

4. If any cattle, sheep, or goats are moved in contravention of the provisions of this Order, the owner thereof, and the person directing or permitting their removal, and the company or person removing or conveying them, shall each be deemed guilty of an offence against this Order.

(signed) *C. L. Peel.*

MEMORANDUM.

THE following ORDERS are not included in this Set.

367	25 September 1873	Merely altering defined part, Southampton.
376 377	9 August - 1875	Ditto - ditto - Middlesbrough.
378 370	9 August - 1875	Ditto - ditto - Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
398	20 April - 1877	Ditto - ditto - Southampton.
399	24 April - 1877	Declaring infected places.
403 404	1 May - 1877	
405	3 May - 1877	
408	18 May - 1877	

Appendix, No. 4.

LIST of LOCAL AUTHORITIES in whose DISTRICTS (either wholly or in part) REGULATIONS have been made under the CATTLE PLAGUE ORDER of 1877.

COUNTIES.

Aberdeen.	Hertford.	Notts.
Bedford.	Huntingdon.	Oxford.
Berks.	Kent.	Perth.
Brecon.	Kincardine.	Peterborough, Liberty of
Bucks.	Kirkcudbright.	Rutland.
Chester.	Lancaster.	Surrey.
Clackmannan.	Lincoln, Parts of Holland.	Warwick.
Cumberland.	„ „ Kesteven.	Westmoreland.
Dumfries.	„ „ Lindsey.	Wigtown.
Durham.	Middlesex.	Worcester.
Elgin.	Nairn.	York, East Riding.
Essex.	Northampton.	„ North „
Forfar.	Northumberland.	„ West „
Gloucester.		

METROPOLIS.

BOROUGHS OR BURGHS.

Annan.	Hertford.	Pontefract.
Bedford.	Huntingdon.	Reading.
Bewdley.	Lochmaben.	Saint Ives (Hunts.)
Carlisle.	London.	Stockton-on-Tees.
Dumfries.	Louth.	Stratford-upon-Avon.
Dundee.	Northampton.	Tynemouth.
Elgin.	Norwich.	Windsor.
Forfar.	Oxford.	Worcester.
Gravesend.	Peterborough.	York.
Hereford.	Perth.	

LIST of LOCAL AUTHORITIES in whose DISTRICTS (either wholly or in part) REGULATIONS have been made for FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE.

COUNTIES.

ENGLAND AND WALES:	England and Wales—*cont^d.*	England and Wales—*cont^d.*
Bedford.	Flint.	Pembroke.
Berks.	Gloucester.	Rutland.
Brecon.	Hants.	Salop.
Bucks.	Hertford.	Somerset.
Cambridge.	Huntingdon.	Suffolk.
Chester.	Kent.	Surrey.
Cornwall.	Lancaster.	Sussex.
Cumberland.	Lincoln (Parts of Kesteven).	Warwick.
Denbigh.	Middlesex.	Westmoreland.
Derby.	Monmouth.	Wilts.
Devon.	Norfolk.	Worcester.
Dorset.	Northumberland.	York, East Riding.
Durham.	Notts.	„ North „
Essex.	Oxford.	

COUNTIES—*continued.*

Scotland:	Scotland—*continued.*	Scotland—*continued.*
Aberdeen.	Dumfries.	Nairn.
Argyll.	Edinburgh.	Perth.
Ayr.	Elgin.	Selkirk.
Banff.	Fife.	Stirling.
Berwick.	Kirkcudbright.	Sutherland.
Clackmannan.	Lanark.	Wigtown.
Dumbarton.	Linlithgow.	

METROPOLIS.

BOROUGHS.

England and Wales:	England and Wales—*cont^d.*	England and Wales—*cont^d.*
Barrow-in-Furness.	Devizes.	Penzance.
Bath.	Faversham.	Plymouth.
Berwick.	Hove.	Reading.
Bedford.	Kendal.	Reigate.
Birmingham.	Lincoln.	Richmond.
Bridgnorth.	Liskeard.	Rochester.
Brighton.	Maidstone.	Shrewsbury.
Cambridge.	Newbury.	Southampton.
Canterbury.	Norwich.	Stockton-on-Tees.
Carlisle.	Oswestry.	Wrexham.
Derby.	Oxford.	York.

BURGHS.

Scotland.	Scotland—*continued.*
Aberdeen.	Perth.
Banff.	Stranraer.
Edinburgh.	

SUMMARY.

COUNTIES—ENGLAND AND WALES	42
COUNTIES—SCOTLAND	20
METROPOLIS	1
BOROUGHS—ENGLAND AND WALES	33
BURGHS—SCOTLAND	5
	101

Appendix, No. 4.

LIST of Local Authorities who Prohibited Movement of Cattle into their Districts.

County of Bedford.
County of Bucks.
County of Forfar.
County of Gloucester.
County of Hertford.
County of Huntingdon.
County of Lancaster, Salford Hundred.
County of Lincoln.
County of Northampton.
County of Rutland.
County of York, East Riding.

Note.—Most of these prohibitions were afterwards modified, and cattle were admitted conditionally.

LIST of Local Authorities who Prohibited Movement of Cattle into their Districts, unless with a Certificate, License, &c.

County of Aberdeen.
County of Bedford.
County of Berks.
County of Brecon.
County of Bucks.
County of Clackmannan.
County of Cumberland.
County of Dumfries.
County of Durham.
County of Essex.
County of Forfar.
County of Hertford.
County of Huntingdon.
County of Kincardine.
County of Kirkcudbright.
County of Lancaster, Salford Hundred.
County of Middlesex.
County of Northampton.
County of Northumberland.
County of Oxford.
Peterborough, Liberty of.
County of Warwick.
County of Westmoreland.
County of Wigtown.
County of Worcester.
County of York:
North Riding.
West Riding.

Metropolis.

Boroughs, or Burghs:

Annan.
Bedford.
Carlisle.
Dumfries.
Dundee.
Forfar.
Hertford.
Lochmaben.
Northampton.
Norwich.
Oxford.
Peterborough.
Pontefract.
Stratford-upon-Avon.
Tynemouth.

LIST of Local Authorities who regulated Movement of Cattle within their Districts.

County of Bedford.
County of Essex (in certain Districts).
County of Lincoln. (Movement of cattle without license, afterwards prohibited by Order of Privy Council).
County of Middlesex.
Peterborough, Liberty of
County of York, East Riding. (Movement of cattle without license, afterwards prohibited by Order of Privy Council).

The Metropolis (afterwards regulated by Order of Privy Council).

Boroughs:

Hull.
London.
Peterborough.

LIST of LOCAL AUTHORITIES who closed Markets, &c., in their Districts.

County of Berks.
County of Essex (in certain Districts).
County of Gloucester.
County of Lancaster (Salford Hundred).
County of Lincoln. (Markets, &c., afterwards closed by Order of Privy Council).
County of Middlesex.

County of Notts:
- Bingham Division.
- Nottingham Division.

County of Oxford.
County of Rutland.
County of Warwick (except for fat stock).

County of York:
- East Riding. (Markets, &c., afterwards closed by Order of Privy Council).
- North Riding.
- West Riding.

BOROUGHS:
- Hull.
- Oxford.
- Peterborough.
- Pontefract.
- Stratford-upon-Avon (except for fat stock).

LIST of LOCAL AUTHORITIES who made certain REGULATIONS under the CATTLE PLAGUE ORDER of 1877, not enumerated in Previous Lists.

County of Chester.
County of Elgin.
County of Inverness.
County of Kent.
County of Nairn.

County of Notts:
- East Retford Division.
- Newark Division.

County of Perth.
County of Surrey.

BOROUGHS, OR BURGHS:
- Bewdley.
- Elgin.
- Gravesend.
- Hereford.
- Huntingdon.
- Perth.
- St. Ives (Hunts).
- Stockton-on Tees.
- Windsor.
- Worcester.
- York, City of.

CATTLE PLAGUE.—COUNTY OF WORCESTER.

AT a Meeting of the Executive Committee of the Local Authority of the County of Worcester, for the purposes of "The Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869," held at the County Hall, Worcester, on Monday, the 2nd day of April 1877:

Present:

The Rev. John Pearson, in the Chair.

The Right Hon. the Earl of Dudley.
George Woodyatt Hastings, Esq.
Sir Richard Harington, Bart.
John Gregory Watkins, Esq.
Edward Vincent Wheeler, Esq.
George Whitaker-Wilson, Esq.

It is ordered, under the authority of "The Cattle Plague Order of 1877," as follows:

1. This Order shall take effect from and immediately after the 10th day of April 1877, and shall continue in force for one calendar month from that date, unless sooner revoked.

2. No cattle brought into the district of the county of Worcester, by rail or by water, shall be removed or landed from the truck or vessel in which such cattle are brought, at any place within the district of the said county.

3. No cattle shall be moved (otherwise than by rail) into the district of the county of Worcester from the district of any other Local Authority (other than the districts of the City of Worcester, and of the boroughs of Bewdley, Droitwich, Evesham, and Kidderminster, respectively), except under a license to be signed by a justice of the peace for the said county of Worcester, such license to continue in force for three days from the date to be named therein, and to be verified by a declaration of the owner of the cattle, or his agent, that such cattle have been in the possession of the owner thereof

Appendix, No. 4.

thereof for twenty-eight days immediately preceding the date of such declaration, and have not, during that time, been affected, or in contact with cattle affected, with any contagious disease.

County Hall, Worcester,
2 April 1877.

Wm. Nichols Marcy,
Clerk of the Peace.

The term "cattle" means bulls, cows, oxen, heifers, or calves.

PROHIBITION.

Cattle Plague.—County of Gloucester.

Order prohibiting Movement of Cattle into the County.

County of Gloucester, to Wit.

At the General Quarter Sessions of the Peace of Our Sovereign Lady the Queen, holden at the Shire Hall, in Gloucester, for the county aforesaid, on Tuesday, the twentieth day of March, in the fortieth year of the Reign of Our Sovereign Lady Victoria, by the Grace of God of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland Queen, Defender of the Faith, and in the year of Our Lord 1877. Before Sebastian Stewart Dickinson, Esquire; Charles Sumner, Esquire (Chairman); and others, their Fellows, Her Majesty's Justices of the Peace for the said county, as the district Local Authority of the same county.

It is ordered under the authority of the "Cattle Plague Order of 1877:"

That the holding of markets, fairs, exhibitions, or sales of cattle within the county of Gloucester be prohibited for twenty-eight days from the 27th March 1877, except as follows:

Cattle belonging to the owner or occupier of premises not in an infected place, may be sold on those premises if the cattle are not affected with cattle-plague, and have been on those premises in possession of the owner or occupier thereof not less than twenty-eight days immediately before the sale.

Cattle within a defined part of a port which have been delivered to the owner or his agent may be sold within such defined part.

Markets.—Exhibitions and sales of cattle may be held under license of the Privy Council.

That from the 27th March 1877, no cattle landed from any vessel in any part of the district of the county of Gloucester be moved from the place of landing to any other part of the county, for a period of twenty-eight days from the said 27th of March.

And that for a period of twenty-eight days from the same date the entrance of cattle into the district of the Local Authority of the county of Gloucester from any district under any Local Authority in England or Scotland be prohibited: provided that the above prohibitions shall not restrict the moving of any cattle by railway through or out of the district of the Gloucestershire Local Authority.

Shire Hall, Gloucester,
20 March 1877.

Geo. Riddiford,
Clerk of the Peace.

The term "cattle" means bulls, cows, oxen, heifers, and calves.

PROHIBITION.

County of Buckingham.

Prevention of Cattle Plague.

Whereas cattle plague has appeared at several places in the metropolis, and very recently at Shepherd's Bush, in the county of Middlesex, within eight miles of the confines of this county:

Notice is hereby given, that the Executive Committee of the Local Authority for the purposes of "The Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869," for the county of Buckingham, have this day, in pursuance of the power given to them by "The Cattle Plague Order of 1877," made a Regulation prohibiting the movement into this county of cattle from the district

trict of any other Local Authority: Provided, nevertheless, that such prohibition shall not restrict the moving of any cattle by railway through or out of the said county.

The word "cattle" in the above Regulation means bulls, cows, oxen, heifers and calves.

This Regulation is to take effect on and after Saturday, the 7th day of April 1877, and to remain in force for one calendar month from that day.

If any cattle are moved in contravention of the above Regulation the owner thereof, and the person directing or permitting their removal, and the company or person removing or conveying them, will each be deemed guilty of an offence against the said "Cattle Plague Order of 1877," and be liable to a penalty not exceeding 20 *l.*; and where such offence is committed with respect to more than four animals, to a penalty not exceeding 5 *l.* for each animal.

By Order,

(signed) *Acton Tindal,*
Clerk of the Peace for Bucks.

Dated this 29th day of March 1877.

MOVEMENT *into* DISTRICT WITH A LICENSE.

The Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869, and the Cattle Plague Order of 1877

COUNTY OF LANCASTER.—HUNDRED OF SALFORD.

RULES for the Cattle Plague or Rinderpest.

THE Executive Cattle Plague Committee for the Hundred of Salford, in the county of Lancaster, being the Local Authority under the provisions of the "Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869," do hereby, under and by virtue and in exercise of the powers vested in and conferred upon such Local Authority, by the said Act, or by any Order of Council made thereunder, rescind their Order of the 24th day of February last, and in lieu thereof the said committee do hereby, with the view of preventing the introduction or the spreading of the cattle plague or rinderpest within the said hundred, make and issue the following Regulations:—

1. The word "cattle" shall mean cows, bulls, oxen, heifers, and calves, and the word "jurisdiction" shall mean so much and such part of the Hundred of Salford as under the provisions of the "Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869," is under the jurisdiction of the said committee for the purposes of the said Act.

2. No cattle shall be brought or moved into the said jurisdiction without a license signed by a justice of the peace acting in the district from which the cattle are proposed to be moved, such license to be accompanied by a certificate of a veterinary surgeon that the said cattle are free from disease, and by a declaration by the owner or his agent (to be made in the presence of the justice granting the license), that the cattle have been in the owner's possession for 28 days immediately preceding the date of such declaration, and have not during that time been affected with or been herded with cattle affected with any contagious or infectious disease: Provided always, that such license shall only be in force for three days from the date thereof; and provided also that nothing herein contained shall restrict the moving of any cattle by railway through or out of the said jurisdiction.

3. If any cattle are moved in contravention of the foregoing Regulation, the owner thereof and the person directing or permitting their removal, and the company or person removing or conveying them, shall each be guilty of an offence against the said Act and Order.

4. No market, fair, exhibition, or sale of cattle shall be held within the said jurisdiction except as follows:—

Cattle belonging to the owner or occupier of premises not in an infected place may be sold on those premises if the cattle are not affected with cattle-plague, and have been on those premises in possession of the owner or occupier thereof not less than 28 days immediately before the sale.

5. If any cattle are sold or exposed or put up for sale, or exhibited in contravention of these Regulations, the seller thereof and the auctioneer putting the same up for sale, or the person exposing the same for sale or exhibiting the same, shall each be deemed guilty of an offence against the said Act and Order; and if any person holds a market, exhibition, or sale in contravention of these Regulations he shall be deemed guilty of an offence against the said Act and Order.

6. If any person acts in contravention of or is guilty of any offence against the said Act, Order, or these Regulations, he shall for every such offence be liable to a penalty not exceeding 20 *l.* Where any offence is committed with respect to more than four animals a penalty not exceeding 5 *l.* for each animal may be imposed instead of the penalty of 20 *l.*

By Order of the Committee,

(signed) *Birchall, Wilson, & Hulton,*
Deputy Clerks of the Peace.

Dated this 23rd day of April 1877.

Appendix, No. 4.

LIBERTY OF PETERBOROUGH.

MOVEMENT *within* DISTRICT.

At a Meeting of the Executive Committee, held at the Office of the Clerk of the Peace, on Saturday, the 24th day of February 1877, at 12 o'clock.

PRESENT:

The Marquis of Exeter in the Chair.

Charles J. Strong, Esq.	Edward A. Skrimshire, Esq.
William Paley, Esq.	J. Yeoman, Esq.

It is ordered that the following Regulations for the movement of cattle within such part of the Liberty of Peterborough as is not within the City and Borough of Peterborough, be, and the same are hereby made; and that they be put in operation on and after the 3rd day of March next.

No cattle shall be moved into or from one place to another, within the said liberty, without the written license of a justice of the peace of the said liberty, or of one of the following persons, viz.:—

Mr. Thomas Close, of Barnack.	Mr. George Allatt, of Marholme.
Mr. Thomas Vergette, of Borough Fen.	Mr. John Rippon, of Maxey.
Mr. Thomas Carter, of Ailsworth.	Mr. John Odam, of Newborough.
Mr. John Beecroft, of Eye.	Mr. William Cole, of Northborough.
Mr. Samuel Vergette, of Glinton.	Mr. Francis Gordon, of Thornhaugh.
Mr. William W. Pearce, of Helpstone.	Mr. Clement W. Griffin, of Werrington.

The movement of cattle from one part to another of the same farm or occupation is exempt from the above Regulations, provided they do not pass more than 100 yards along any public highway.

The Clerk of the Peace is directed to publish the above Regulations, and report the same for approval of the Privy Council.

The Committee appointed Mr. Wattam, M.R.C.V.S., of St. Martin's, Stamford, an Inspector for the liberty under The Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869, in addition to Messrs. Mackinder, who are already appointed, and on the same terms.

(signed) *Exeter.*

CLOSING MARKETS.

CATTLE PLAGUE.—COUNTY OF OXFORD.

AT a Meeting of the Executive Committee of the Local Authority of the county of Oxford, for the purposes of The Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869, held at the County Hall, Oxford, on Friday, the 23rd of February 1877.

PRESENT:

Charles Edward Thornhill, Esq., Chairman.

The Earl of Jersey.	Henry Norris, Esq.
Sir Henry William Dashwood, Bart.	Major John Augustus Fane.
Charles Lane, Esq.	Holford Cotton Risley, Esq., and
Charles Jacob Bullock Marsham, Esq.	William Earle Biscoe, Esq.

Mr. Hamersley, the elected Chairman of the Committee, not being present, the members now present chose Mr. Thornhill (one of their number) to be chairman of the meeting.

The Order of the Privy Council, dated the 13th instant, having been read, the chairman reviewed the provisions against the spread of cattle plague contained in the Act 32 & 33 Vict. chap. 70, and the Order in Council of the 5th of June 1875, part of such provisions being that an owner must, with all practical speed, give notice of any outbreak to a constable, and the constable to the inspector of the district, who must forthwith make a provisional declaration that the premises and contiguous fields, &c., are an infected area. Then the Executive Committee are to confirm or negative the inspector's declaration, with power to increase the area by an additional circuit of one mile. Further, that, under the sixth schedule of the Act, no animal is to be moved alive out of the area; and carcases, skins,

skins, offal, &c., only under special conditions by license. And the chairman explained that the Consolidated Order of the Executive Committee, dated the 12th day of July 1875, provides how and by whom licenses may be granted. Further, that burial, disinfection of premises, &c., are also provided for. Also, that the Executive Committee has power to expand the existing statutory precautions, and may make regulations with reference to commons, to the closing of markets, to the prohibition of movement, and to other matters.

After a discussion of the existing powers of the Committee irrespective of the said Order of the 13th instant, and upon consideration of the circumstances which dictated that Order,—the meeting resolved (upon the motion of the Earl of Jersey, seconded by Mr. Holford Risley),—and it is hereby ordered that, from and after Monday the fifth day of March next, the holding of markets, fairs, exhibitions, or sales of cattle within the county of Oxford proper * (that is, the district of the Executive Committee), is prohibited, until a further Order be made:—[the term "Cattle" meaning bulls, cows, oxen, heifers, and calves].

Provided always, that by virtue of the said Order of the 13th instant, cattle belonging to the owner or occupier of premises not in an infected place may be sold on those premises if the cattle are not affected with cattle plague, and have been on those premises in possession of the owner or occupier thereof, not less than twenty-eight days immediately before the sale.

Also that markets, exhibitions, and sales of cattle may be held under license of the Privy Council. And cattle exposed for sale in a market, the holding whereof for the sale of cattle for immediate slaughter is licensed by the Privy Council, may be kept alive for a period of ten days after such exposure, and no longer.

Further, that the owner, consignee, or other person exposing any cattle in a market, the holding whereof for the sale of cattle for immediate slaughter is licensed by the Privy Council, shall, at his own expense, mark them as follows:

> By clipping the hair off the end of the tail, and by clipping a broad arrow, about five inches long, on the left quarter.

Any infringement of this Order of the Executive Committee (embracing the above provisions), will involve heavy pecuniary penalties.

And, as to compensation to be made for animals ordered to be slaughtered, the meeting ratified, and desire to call attention to the following Resolution passed by the Executive Committee on the 12th of July 1875:—

> "That, in fixing the amount to be paid in cases of slaughter, the Committee will have regard to the degree of caution shown by the owner in making the purchase of the slaughtered animal or animals, and especially as to the care shown by him in keeping all newly-purchased animals apart from his general herd for a period sufficiently long to warrant him in the belief that such newly-purchased animals were free from disease: and also that the Committee will in every case require satisfactory evidence upon these points prior to their adjudication."

The Committee appointed to meet again, at the County Hall, at 12 o'clock on Saturday, the 10th of March next.

John M. Davenport,
Clerk of the Peace.

Surrey.

Contagious and Infectious Diseases among Animals.

At a Meeting of the Executive Committee of the Justices of the Peace of the county of Surrey, for the purposes of The Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869, being the "Local Authority" under the said Act for the county of Surrey (except the boroughs of Godalming, Guildford, Kingston-on-Thames, and Reigate, and the district of the Metropolitan Board of Works), held at the Sessions House, Newington, in the said county, on Thursday, the 29th day of March 1877.

Cattle Plague.

"Ordered that the movement of cattle from the county of Middlesex into the county of Surrey, be, and the same is, hereby prohibited."

By Order of the Committee,

R. H. Wyatt,
Clerk of the Peace.

* The city of Oxford and the borough of Banbury are separate jurisdictions.

Appendix, No. 5.

PAPERS handed in by Mr. *Stratton*, 22 June 1877.

(A.)

Appendix, No. 5.

Mr. *C. E. Wilmot* to Mr. *W. Beach*, M.P.

" Veterinary Department, Privy Council Office,
" 44, Parliament-street, Westminster, S.W.
" 11 November 1876.

" Sir,

" In reply to your letter of the 24th ultimo, addressed to the Lord President, requesting to know the decision at which his Grace had arrived on the memorial presented by you in June last, from the Central Chamber of Agriculture, and the Farmers' Club, on the subject of cattle disease, I am directed to state that the memorial has been under his Grace's serious consideration.

" Referring to the 11 regulations submitted by your Committee, and proposed to be enforced for the prevention of contagious diseases of animals, I am instructed to offer the following observations:—

" (1.) It appears to the Lord President that there are practical difficulties in the way of carrying out your proposal in regard to foreign animals intended to be slaughtered for meat, and further, that such a scheme as that proposed would obviously alter the whole system at present in force as regards the trade of this country with foreign animals.

" (2.) I am directed to point out the extreme difficulty by which the carrying out of your second proposition would be surrounded. It must be remembered that at every port where store stock would be landed, the quarantine station would naturally become a centre of infection, and unless the quarantine ground were of such gigantic proportions as would be extravagantly expensive, both as regards area and accommodation, disease in one cargo would render it a hotbed of infection to subsequent cargoes, so that congestion would inevitably ensue; *i. e.*, when one cargo had developed disease, each succeeding cargo would be exposed to infection, and the store stock quarantine grounds would become lazarettos, where disease would be always latent, and generally active.

" At present there is only one quarantine ground existing in Great Britain, viz., at the port of Southampton; but it has been established for a special purpose. It was not intended that cargoes from unscheduled countries should be placed therein to be detained for a certain period, and then be emancipated from all restrictions, but that cattle arriving there from scheduled countries should undergo quarantine, and should then be liberated, instead of being landed at the defined part of any other port, in which case they would of necessity be slaughtered within ten days. The quarantine ground at the port of Southampton has chiefly been used to enable valuable store stock and milch cows to be imported from scheduled countries, more particularly from France. During 1875 the number of animals that underwent quarantine at Southampton was only 83.

" The further suggestion with reference to foreign countries where pleuro-pneumonia exists would appear practically to 'schedule' every foreign country; as, though there does not from information received appear to be any prevalence of pleuro-pneumonia in any one of them, there are doubtless isolated cases in all, or nearly all of them.

" (3.) I am to draw your attention to the fact that Ireland being an integral portion of the United Kingdom, animals arriving in Great Britain are subject to the same restrictions as animals arriving in one district from another in Great Britain, and that the treatment of animals in Ireland is under the direct control of the Irish Privy Council. The Lord President is in constant communication with the Irish authorities, with a view to the adoption of such measures as may ensure an efficient inspection in that country.

" (4.) I have to state that all the Privy Council regulations in regard to the vessels bringing animals to this country, are specially under the charge of the travelling inspectors of the Privy Council, and of the inspectors of the Privy Council stationed at the various ports of Great Britain where animals are landed; and that prosecutions at the instance of the Privy Council are instituted by the Treasury when any flagrant breach of any of these regulations takes place. The treatment of the animals, the accommodation provided, and the cleansing and disinfection of the ships carrying them, are already made subjects of special examination and report. This will be further referred to by me in reply to your proposal, No. 7.

" (5) I am

"(5.) I am directed to remind you that in 1873, in consequence of the Report of the Parliamentary Committee on the Contagious Diseases (Animals), the permissive powers then in force for regulating the movement of animals exposed to foot-and-mouth disease were revoked, and that they were only restored in the following year at the earnest request of several agricultural bodies. From the great diversity of opinions on the subject, there appears to be little doubt that the country would not now be prepared to submit to the imposition of such stringent and uniform restrictions as your society consider would be effectual to check the spread of this disease, such restrictions never having been hitherto resorted to, except during the actual prevalence of the cattle plague.

"(6.) I am to point out that the powers proposed to be conferred on local inspectors in proposition 6 are so arbitrary, and even aggressive, that there would be great difficulties in carrying them out. In the years when rinderpest was most prevalent in this country, such powers were never conferred on inspectors, and his Grace is of opinion that to propose to establish them now would be calculated to raise an organised opposition throughout the country.

"(7.) The Privy Council have already serving under them five gentlemen appointed as travelling inspectors, who inspect fairs, markets, railways, and ships employed in the importation of foreign animals, and their services have been found to be most beneficial to the public interests; but I am to point out that the local inspectors are entirely under the control of the local authorities of the respective districts for which they are appointed, under the provisions of the Act. It would appear to be within the scope of the duties of each local authority to appoint a superintending inspector, who, by careful supervision within his district, would ensure that the orders of the Privy Council, and of his actual employers, should be rigidly enforced. There would appear to be insuperable difficulties in the way of a central authority, such as the Privy Council, supervising the action of all the inspectors of the various local authorities of Great Britain, as proposed by your Society.

"(8.) I am to point out that by one of the provisions of the Animals Order of 1875, owners are now compelled to give notice of any case of an animal affected with a contagious disease, and are forbidden to move such animal, and that the further power of forbidding animals that have been in contact with disease to be moved is conferred on local authorities by Article 36 of the same Order.

"(9.) I am to state that this regulation would appear to be of so stringent a character that it would be impossible to carry it out in cases of contagious and infectious diseases generally. The Select Committee of the House of Commons, in 1873, reported strongly against such a measure being adopted in the case of foot-and-mouth disease, and I am instructed to state that his Grace is unable to accept the proposal.

"(10.) I am instructed to state that the prohibitions suggested have only been in force during the time that rinderpest was prevalent in this country, and that their stringency was frequently the subject of animadversion even under those peculiar circumstances. His Grace is of opinion that the Privy Council would not be justified, except under very exceptional circumstances, in adopting so severe a measure as that proposed by you, to meet the case of a prevalence of foot-and-mouth disease.

"(11.) The proposal that the compensation to be awarded to the owner in the case of compulsory slaughter for pleuro-pneumonia, should bear a certain proportion to the loss sustained rather than to the value of the animal, was adopted by the Committee of 1873. The difficulty of ascertaining the amount of loss so sustained has prevented the Lords of the Council from giving effect to that recommendation, but I am to point out that the maximum amount of compensation has been raised from one-half the value, not exceeding 20 *l.*, to three-fourths, not exceeding 30 *l.* I am to add that any alteration in the period of isolation of cattle that have been herded with cattle affected with pleuro-pneumonia, can only be made by Act of Parliament, not by an Order of Council.

"In conclusion, I am instructed to express the deep interest which the Lord President takes in all things connected with the importation of animals and the prevention of the diseases to which they are subject, and I am to assure you that his Grace is fully impressed with the necessity of providing every possible safeguard against the introduction of disease into this country, without unduly interfering with an important branch of trade in which importers and consumers are alike interested.

"I am, &c.

(signed) "*Charles Eardley Wilmot*,

"For Secretary.

"W. W. B. Beach, Esq., M.P.,
"Oakley Hall, Basingstoke."

Appendix No. 5.

(B.)

From the "Chamber of Agriculture Journal and Farmers' Chronicle," the Organ of the Chambers of Agriculture.

London, 12 February 1877.

THE Council meeting of the Central and Associated Chambers of Agriculture at the Salisbury Hotel, on Tuesday, was attended by 13 members representing the Central Chamber, and 34 deputed members from 22 Associated Chambers, Earl Fortescue presiding. The Chambers represented were—The Central, Banbury, Buckinghamshire, Cambridgeshire, Essex, Gloucestershire, Hampshire, Hertfordshire, Herefordshire, East Kent, West Kent, Leicestershire, Lincolnshire, Nottinghamshire, Peterborough, Shropshire, Somersetshire, Staffordshire, East Suffolk, Warwickshire, South Wiltshire, Worcestershire, West Riding of Yorkshire.

Sir George S. Jenkinson, Bart., M.P., was unanimously elected vice-chairman for 1877, to succeed to the chair in 1878. The following important resolutions, on the reply of the Lord President to the proposals for the prevention of cattle disease, were carried unanimously, with the exception of one dissentient:—

"This Council regrets that the reply of the Lord President is unsatisfactory."

"The Council cannot admit that the difficulties attending interference with existing trade are insuperable; the contrary being proved by the successful importation of dead meat from America."

"That this Council considers that an alteration in the manner of conducting the trade in animals with the Continent of Europe is absolutely necessary, and firmly maintains the proposals of the joint deputation with regard to slaughter, quarantine, and uniform internal regulations, as the minimum that can be considered to afford anything like adequate protection from disease."

"That in view of the altered circumstances of the present time, this Council desires to press as strongly as possible the great desirableness of the slaughter of all cattle at the port of embarkation, except such as are intended for, and entered as, store stock; and that such live stock shall be admitted, as before proposed, only under regulations of strict quarantine at the ports of debarkation."

"That copies of these resolutions be sent to the Lord President of the Privy Council and to the Premier."

Appendix, No. 6.

PAPER handed in by Sir *Alexander Wood.*

SCHEME submitted in February 1876 to the PRIVY COUNCIL in reference to the working of the CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) ACT.

Appendix, No. 6.

THE prevalence of contagious diseases among live stock excites increasing apprehensions among breeders, dealers, and consumers, and commands the grave attention not only of local authorities but of both Houses of Parliament.

Stringent regulations have been enforced in England to prevent the spread of disease, but in Ireland, where circumstances are entirely different, these measures are inapplicable. While England is an importing, Ireland is to a very large extent a producing and exporting country, and it is of the utmost importance to both that every practicable facility should be afforded to the cattle traffic between them; therefore a combination of the greatest precaution with the least restriction is the end to be obtained.

It is with these views that the question as affecting the south of Ireland and the west of England has been practically dealt with by the undersigned, who respectfully submit the following suggestions for the consideration of Her Majesty's Government.

For the purpose of meeting the several contingencies of the traffic effective provisions must be made for:—

1st. Facilitating the embarkation of healthy stock.

2nd. The isolation and treatment of unhealthy stock.

3rd. Precautionary dealing with animals that may have been in contact with unhealthy stock.

4th. Their subsequent consignment, after approval by the Government inspectors, to English markets.

It is proposed that depôts (on the plan shown by the attached Diagram No. 1) be prepared at the shipping ports in Ireland (Cork and Waterford), and used under the control and supervision of the Government inspectors, for the reception of cattle intended for importation only.

They will be in four principal divisions, namely: the "Examination Pound," from which, as examined, the animals will pass either into the "Shipping Pens" for healthy stock, the "Infirmary Pens" for unhealthy animals, or the "Quarantine Pens" for suspected stock; slaughter-houses will also be attached for use when required. The floors will be of Staffordshire bricks; there will be a plentiful supply of good water, and every provision made to secure perfect cleanliness and disinfection; the pens will be roofed, so that the risks arising from the use of litter and from exposure to cold after travelling, will be avoided.

On the arrival of consignments of stock at the respective depôts, each animal will be passed separately through the "Examination Pound" by the Government inspector, and if the whole consignment from one consignor proves to be healthy, they will at once be taken to the "Shipping Pens."

If, on the contrary, a consignment arrives consisting of healthy and unhealthy stock, the former will be taken to the "Quarantine Pens" and the latter to the "Infirmary Pens," and both will be detained until pronounced sound by the Government inspector.

Depôts on the same principle will be provided at the landing ports on the English side, and similar regulations enforced.

For the Bristol market, where the greatest difficulties have been experienced, Portishead Pier will be the landing place, and Diagram No. 2 shows the arrangements there.

An isolated road leads from the pier landing stages to the depôts, and a similar road from the depôt to the railway loading pens, and the trucks in which the cattle will be conveyed to Bristol.

At the Bristol Station there will again be a private passage from the trucks into the Bristol Cattle Market.

It is believed by this scheme every possible facility will be given for the Irish breeders and dealers to supply healthy stock to the English markets, while the English farmers and graziers resorting to the markets as buyers or sellers, will be protected from the risks of imported disease, which now render valueless the severe restrictions to which they have to

Appendix, No. 6.

submit, and both home and imported stock will be guarded from the alleged dangers of infected roads.

At Cork, Waterford, Milford, and Portishead, sites well adapted for depôts have been provisionally secured, and can be made at once available on very reasonable terms, while the entire cost at each place will be but small when compared with the value of the important results to be obtained.

The undersigned have not entered upon the cost of management, nor of the charges, if any, for entering the depôts, nor for the necessary care and fodder to be provided in the case of detention, believing such details would be more properly settled by Government after the principle embodied in the above suggestions is admitted.

---

1. Like Orders in Council, by the Queen in England, and by the Lord Lieutenant in Ireland, should declare that all live stock, except horses and asses, passing from Ireland into England, and *vice versâ*, before embarkation, shall be properly inspected, and none but healthy stock shall be allowed to embark; and also stock in contact with any that is unhealthy shall be detained.

2. The orders also should provide that at certain ports, where the extent of the cattle trade may justify their establishment, depôts should be formed, where, so soon as they shall be erected, the inspection shall take place, and consequently no animals will be embarked at these ports unless they are passed through the depôts.

3. Like regulations to be made for the inspection of animals after the voyage, also at approved depôts.

In order to encourage the erection of these depôts, the following arrangements to be adopted:—

1. At certain ports to be declared by Government as requiring depôts (the sites for the same with water frontage to be preferred), shall be provided by either local authorities or railway and steamship companies.

2. When approved by Government, the owners of the sites shall submit plans of their distribution and proposed erections for Government approval; and when approved, the whole of the authorised outlay for the same shall be provided, in the first instance, by Government. But as regards one-half of the amount so to be expended, it shall be repaid with interest at per cent. in years.

3. The tariff of charges, and rules of management, to be approved by Government, as in the case of depôts for the reception of foreign animals.

Appendix, No. 7.

PAPER handed in by Sir *C. Alexander Wood*, 25 June 1877.

GREAT WESTERN RAILWAY.

Appendix, No. 7.

Chief Goods Manager's Office, Paddington Station,
London, March 1877.

1. I BEG to inform you that the Great Western Railway Company have two rates for the carriage of Fish Traffic from New Milford to places in England: the one an Insurance Rate, in respect of which the Company undertake the liabilities of common carriers; the other a Cheap Rate, in respect of which the owners take the entire risk of the journey. The Company will not undertake to deliver the fish carried at the cheap rate in time for any particular market, nor will they be responsible for any loss, delay, or damage in transit, except upon proof that such loss, delay, or damage occurred through the wilful neglect or misconduct of the servants of the Company.

2. The rates given on the other side are calculated at the cheap rate, and are those which will be in force during the season of 1877; the insurance rates are calculated at 25 per cent. in excess of the cheap rates.

3. The rates include delivery in London, but not at any other place. The Birmingham rates apply to Snow Hill, Bordesley, and Hockley Stations.

4. All fish not expressly consigned at the cheap rate, will be carried and charged at the insurance rates.

5. No rebate or drawback will be allowed off the rates.

6. The fish, whether packed in boxes or baskets, will be carried and charged at the actual gross weight.

7. The fish handed to the Company at New Milford will be invoiced from that place to destination at the Milford rates, but the sea freight will be added and charged out as a "paid on" in cases where it is desired that the consignee should pay the charges throughout from Kinsale to destination. In all such cases the sea freight must be shown on the consignment notes, and will be accounted for to the senders when paid by the consignees.

8. In order to facilitate the loading and transit of the fish, and to prevent delay or wrong sending at Milford, it is essential that the boxes, &c., should be addressed, or bear some clear and distinctive mark, to show where and to whom the various consignments are to be sent.

9. The fish will be carried by the passenger trains, or by special fish trains from New Milford.

10. It is very desirable that the boats conveying the fish from Kinsale should reach Milford by 11 a.m., so that the fish may be forwarded by the ordinary train, or by special fish trains timed to leave at or about 3.0 p.m. for London, and 2.0 p.m. for Birmingham and the North.

11. Steamers in connection with the Great Western Company sail from Cork and Passage to New Milford, by which some portion of the fish traffic may be carried. Particulars of the days and times of sailing, and of the rates from Cork and Passage, can be obtained from their agent at the former place, and from the City of Cork Steam Packet Company.

12. Special trains will be provided upon special orders being given, when there is a load of not less than 30 tons for the station to which the special is intended to run, or when the carriage for that quantity is paid. Smaller quantities will be sent by the first available train.

I am, &c.
(signed) *John Grant.*

Appendix, No. 7.

RATES for the CONVEYANCE of KINSALE MACKEREL (Season 1877) from NEW MILFORD, at OWNER'S RISK, at the Ton of 20 cwt., and on the Conditions stated in the accompanying Circular.

STATIONS.	Railway Rates from New Milford. s.	d.
GREAT WESTERN:		
London	65	6
Reading	60	–
Oxford		
Banbury		
Leamington		
Warwick		
Birmingham	50	–
West Bromwich		
Wolverhampton		
Walsall	60	–
Wellington	45	–
Nantwich		
Crewe		
Shrewsbury		
Bridgnorth		
Ironbridge		
Welshpool		
Oswestry	40	–
Dolgelly	50	–
Wrexham	35	–
Chester		
Birkenhead	30	–
Liverpool		
Warrington		
Manchester	40	–
Swindon	45	–
Bath	35	–
Bristol		
Bridgwater	55	–
Taunton		
Barnstaple	60	–
Exeter		
Weston-Super-Mare	47	6
Trowbridge	50	–
Devizes		
Hungerford	55	–
Salisbury	55	–
Yeovil		
Bridport	60	–
Dorchester		
Weymouth		
Cirencester	40	–
Stroud		
Cheltenham		
Gloucester		
Chepstow	30	–
Newport		
Cardiff		
Llantrissant		
Bridgend		
Port Talbot		
Neath		
Swansea		
Llanelly		
Llandilo		
Haverfordwest	20	–
Carmarthen		
Aberdare	30	–
Merthyr		
Dowlais		
Mountain Ash		
Tredegar Junction		
Rhymney Junction		

STATIONS.	Railway Rates from New Milford. s.	d.
GREAT WESTERN—*continued.*		
Pontypool	35	–
Monmouth		
Abergavenny		
Hereford	40	–
Leominster		
Presteign	45	–
Kington	42	6
Tenbury	45	–
Ludlow	40	–
Craven Arms	45	–
Ledbury	50	–
Worcester		
Kidderminster	55	–
Stourbridge	50	–
Brettell Lane		
Bilston		
Wednesbury		
Dudley		
CAMBRIAN:		
Aberystwith	45	–
Barmouth	50	–
Llanidloes	45	–
Newtown		
Portmadoc	50	–
Pwllheli		
CONTINENTAL:		
Boulogne	100	–
St. Helier's (Jersey)	90	–
FURNESS RAILWAY:		
Barrow	60	–
Ulverstone		
Whitehaven		
GREAT EASTERN:		
Braintree	90	–
Bury	80	–
Chelmsford	90	–
Colchester		
Dereham		
Diss		
Dunmow		
Ely	80	–
Fakenham	90	–
Hadleigh		
Harwich		
Haverhill	80	–
Huntingdon	60	–
Ipswich	90	–
Kelvedon		
Lowestoft		
Lynn	70	–
Newmarket	80	–
Norwich	90	–
Saffron Waldon	80	–
Sudbury		
Thetford	90	–
Wisbeach	70	–
Yarmouth	90	–

Appendix, No. 7.

STATIONS.	Railway Rates from New Milford. s.	d.
GREAT NORTHERN:		
Batley	50	–
Bawtry	60	–
Boston	70	–
Bourne		
Doncaster	60	–
Grantham		
Holbeach	70	–
Huntingdon	60	–
Louth	70	–
Morley	50	–
Newark	60	–
Sleaford	70	–
Spalding		
Sutton Bridge		
Spilsby		
LONDON & NORTH WESTERN:		
Ashton	40	–
Batley	50	–
Bedford	60	–
Beeston Castle	40	–
Bicester	65	–
Birkenhead	30	–
Bolton	40	–
Birmingham	50	–
Blackburn	40	–
Blackpool	50	–
Bradford	50	–
Builth Road	45	–
Burton	60	–
Cambridge	60	–
Carlisle		
Chester	30	–
Claydon	65	–
Coventry	60	–
Crewe	45	–
Deepfields	50	–
Derby	60	–
Dewsbury	50	–
Dudley		
Halifax		
Higham Ferrers		
Hinckley	60	–
Huddersfield	50	–
Kendal	60	–
Knighton	45	–
Lancaster	50	–
Leeds		
Leicester	60	–
Lichfield		
Liverpool	30	–
Macclesfield	45	–
Manchester	40	–
Market Harboro'	60	–
Mirfield	50	–
Morecambe	50	–
Morley		
Nantwich	45	–
Newport (Salop)	50	–
Normanton		
Northampton	60	–
Northwick	45	–
Nuneaton	60	–
Oldbury	50	–
Oldham	40	–
Oundle	60	–
Penrith		
Peterboro'		
Preston	40	–
Rugby	60	–
St. Helen's	32	6
Stafford	50	–
Staleybridge	40	–

STATIONS.	Railway Rates from New Milford. s.	d.
LONDON & NORTH WESTERN—*continued.*		
Stamford	60	–
Staveley	50	–
Stockport	40	–
Spon Lane	50	–
Tamworth	60	–
Thrapstone		
Towcester		
Tredegar	35	–
Walsall	60	–
Wakefield	50	–
Warrington	30	–
Wellingboro'	60	–
Wednesbury	50	–
Welshpool	45	–
Whitehaven	60	–
Willenhall	50	–
Wigan	35	–
Wilmslow	45	–
Wolverhampton	50	–
Wolverton	65	–
Winslow		
M. S. & L. RAILWAY:		
Ashton	40	–
Barnsley	50	–
Dodworth		
Doncaster	60	–
Gainsboro'	50	–
Grimsby	62	6
Hull		
Kirton Lindsey	60	–
Market Rasen	65	–
Oldham	40	–
Penistone	50	–
Retford		
Rotherham		
Sheffield		
Staleybridge	40	–
Worksop	50	–
MIDLAND:		
Alfreton	60	–
Ashby-de-la-Zouch		
Barnsley	50	–
Bedford	60	–
Berkeley	35	–
Bingley	50	–
Birmingham	50	–
Burton	60	–
Cambridge		
Carlisle		
Chesterfield	50	–
Coalville	60	–
Colne (Lancashire)	50	–
Coventry	60	–
Derby		
Doncaster		
Hinckley		
Huntingdon		
Ilkestone	50	–
Irchester	60	–
Keighley	50	–
Kettering	60	–
Lancaster	50	–
Leicester	60	–
Lincoln		
Loughboro'		
Lynn	70	–
Mansfield	55	–
Market Harboro'	60	–
Masboro'	50	–
Melton Mowbray	60	–

Appendix, No. 7.

STATIONS.	Railway Rates from New Milford.
	s. d.
MIDLAND—*continued.*	
Morecambe	50 –
Newark	60 –
Normanton	50 –
Northampton	60 –
Nuneaton	
Nottingham	55 –
Oakham	60 –
Peterboro'	
Pye Bridge	
Ripley	
Rugby	
Sheffield	50 –
Spalding	70 –
Stamford	60 –
Sutton Bridge	70 –
Swadlincote	60 –
Tamworth	
Thorney	70 –
Thrapstone	60 –
Wellingboro'	
Whittington	
Wirksworth	
Wisbeach	70 –
Worksop	50 –
Willenhall	
MONMOUTHSHIRE:	
Blaenavon	35 –
Brynmawr	
Ebbw Vale	
NORTH EASTERN:	
Barnard Castle	82 6
Castleford	62 6
Darlington	82 6
Durham	
Hartlepool	
Hartlepool, West	

STATIONS.	Railway Rates from New Milford.
	s. d.
NORTH EASTERN—*continued.*	
Hull	62 6
Middlesboro'	82 6
Newcastle	
North Shields	
Richmond	
Scarboro'	
Selby	62 6
Sunderland	82 6
South Shields	
Stockton	
Whitby	
York	62 6
NORTH STAFFORDSHIRE:	
Ashbourne	55 –
Burslem	50 –
Burton	60 –
Derby	
Hanley	50 –
Kidsgrove	
Longton	45 –
Macclesfield	50 –
Newcastle	
Stoke	
Stone	
Tunstall	55 –
Uttoxeter	
LONDON AND SOUTH WESTERN:	
Poole	65 –
Portsmouth	
Southampton	
Wimborne	
Winchester	

EMPTIES.

To MILFORD,

From all stations except the North Eastern Railway and London - 6 *d.* per cwt. S. to S.

„ the North Eastern Railway - - - - - - - 9 *d.* „ „

„ London - - - - - - - - 1*s.* per cwt., including collection.

All carriage on returned empty Kinsale boxes must be prepaid, and the weight of each box will be charged as ½ cwt., half-boxes ¼ cwt. each. All other descriptions of boxes and hampers to be charged on actual weight.

Appendix, No. 7.

GREAT WESTERN RAILWAY.

Chief Goods Manager's Office,
Paddington Station, London, W., 22 June 1877.

RETURN OF WEST OF ENGLAND FISH TRAFFIC FOR 1876.

		Tons. cwt.		£.	s.	d.
22 March to 3 July.	147,647 pads - - -	- 3,475 14	Railway charge	- 18,735	13	5

RETURN OF KINSALE FISH TRAFFIC FOR 1876.

		Tons. cwt.		£.	s.	d.
21 March to 22 June.	91,352 boxes - - -	- 8,758 9	Railway charge -	21,454	6	–
			Sea freight - -	836	11	3
			Total charge - £.	22,290	17	3

GREAT WESTERN RAILWAY.

Chief Goods Manager's Office,
Paddington Station, London, W., 23 June 1877.

RETURN OF WEST OF ENGLAND FISH TRAFFIC FOR 1877.

		Tons. cwt.		£.	s.	d.
7 March to 21 June.	141,972 pads - - -	- 2,983 4	Railway charge -	16,348	10	4

RETURN OF KINSALE FISH TRAFFIC FOR 1877.

		Tons. cwt.		£.	s.	d.
28 March to 20 June.	94,812 boxes - - -	- 9,253 14	Railway charge -	22,282	11	4
			Sea freight - -	2,979	4	3
			Total - - £.	25,261	15	7

Appendix, No. 8.

PAPER handed in by Sir *C. Alexander Wood.*

LIVE STOCK BOAT RATES, IRELAND AND ENGLAND.

Note.—These Rates (excepting those for Horses) include insurance against Sea Risk as follows: Neat Cattle up to 15 *l.* each; Sheep and Pigs up to 2 *l.* each.

	s.	*d.*	
Waterford and New Milford:			
Fat Beasts	7	–	each.
Full-grown Beasts	5	–	,,
Sheep	1	6	,,
Pigs	2	–	,,
Horses (Minimum charge, 60 *s.*)	15	–	,,
Cork and New Milford:			
Fat Beasts	8	–	each.
Store Beasts	6	–	,,
Full-grown Beasts	5	–	,,
Sheep	1	9	,,
Lambs	1	2	,,
Calves	4	–	,,
Pigs	2	6	,,
Gentlemen's Horses	20	–	,,
Dealers' Horses	12	6	,,
Cork and Bristol:			
Fat Beasts	12	9	each.
Lean Beasts	9	9	,,
Two-year-old Beasts	9	9	,,
Yearlings	6	10	,,
Calves	4	4	,,
Pigs	3	4	,,
Sheep	2	6	,,
Lambs	1	9	,,
Horses	20	–	,,
Colts	14	9	,,
Waterford and Bristol:			
Yearlings (not over two years)	7	6	each.
Lean Beasts	9	6	,,
Beasts (not exceeding 30 *l.* value)	12	–	,,
Beasts (exceeding 30 *l.* in value)	15	–	,,
Sheep	2	4	,,
Pigs	3	9	,,
Horses	20	–	,,

	s.	*d.*	
Belfast and Liverpool (Port Rates):			
Horses (private)	22	–	each.
Horses (dealers)	16	6	,,
Ponies (private)	16	6	,,
Ponies (dealers)	11	–	,,
Pony colts in droves	5	5	,,
Fat Cattle	7	3	,,
Springs and Stores	4 *s.* 6 *d.* to	6	9 ,,
Yearlings	2	9	,,
Bacon Pigs	2	9	,,
Pork and Store Pigs	1	9	,,
Sucking Pigs	1	3	,,
Sheep and Calves	1	9	,,
Lambs	1	3	,,

Belfast and Morecambe (Port Rates):

The same Rates apply as to Liverpool (*see* above).

Belfast and Fleetwood (Port Rates):

The same Rates apply as to Liverpool (*see* above).

Belfast and Barrow (Port Rates):

The same Rates apply as to Liverpool (*see* above).

	£.	*s.*	*d.*	
Belfast and London:				
Oxen - 8 for	7	9	3	
Oxen - 9 for	8	17	6	
Oxen - 10 for	10	5	3	
Oxen (over 10 in a truck)	–	19	9	each.
Sheep	–	4	–	,,
Lambs	–	3	–	,,
Pigs	–	4	6	,,
Pigs (Minimum charge 1 to 15, charge as 20).	4	10	–	
Pigs (Minimum charge 16 to 30, charge as 30).	6	15	–	
Calves	–	7	–	each
Mules	–	16	3	,,
Horses	1	10	6	,,

LIVE STOCK BOAT RATES—*continued.*

	s.	d.		
Liverpool and London:				
Oxen	13	6	each.	(Minimum 3).
Sheep	2	8	„	(Minimum 12).
Lambs	2	3	„	(Minimum 15).
Mules	11	3	„	(Minimum 3).
Horses	22	3	„	(Minimum 6).
Pigs and Calves	2	10	„	
Pigs (Minimum 1 to 15, charge as 20)	56	9		
Pigs (Minimum 16 to 30, charge as 30)	85	–		
Calves (Minimum 1 to 15, charge as 20)	56	9		
Calves (Minimum 16 to 30, charge as 30)	85	–		

On and after 1st July 1877, the rate for Horses, Liverpool and London, will be 29 *s.* 10 *d.* each.

Note.—Minimum charge for Sheep, Lambs, and Calves, at head rates, to be as for 20 from Belfast and Liverpool.

Appendix, No. 9.

PAPERS handed in by Mr. *May*.

Appendix, No. 9.

ROYAL DECREE of the 3rd February 1877, containing the appointing of further Regulations for the checking of Lung Disease among Cattle, and also the revoking of the Royal Decrees of the 17th April 1874, of the 9th October 1874, and of the 30th June 1875.

Article 1.—As soon as a head of cattle is attacked with lung disease, the owner, keeper, or shepherd shall cause all the cattle which may in consequence thereof become suspected to be inoculated by a duly qualified veterinary surgeon, if the burgomaster so orders it. Before giving the order, the burgomaster must take the advice of the district veterinary surgeon. The cost of the inoculation done by order of the burgomaster shall be defrayed by the State Treasury at the rate of 50 cents. per head.

If no proper virus can be obtained, in the opinion of the district veterinary surgeon, the burgomaster may give his consent to the postponement of the inoculation until such virus can be procured. The district veterinary surgeon shall supply the veterinary surgeon charged with the inoculation as early as possible with good virus.

If the owner, keeper, or shepherd does not immediately conform to the obligation laid upon him by this article, the inoculation is then to take place by direction of the burgomaster, notwithstanding which he remains liable to a criminal prosecution.

Article 2.—When a head of cattle suspected of lung disease cannot, while in the pasture, be entirely isolated to the satisfaction of the district veterinary surgeon, the burgomaster, acting under his advice, shall order its removal to a stable or other building, with the observance of precautions to be instituted by the burgomaster, with the advice of the district veterinary surgeon, and it shall remain isolated until the expiration of the term mentioned in Article 5 of the Royal Decree of the 30th October 1872.

Article 3.—Our Decrees of the 17th April 1874, of the 9th October 1874, and of the 30th June 1875, are withdrawn.

Article 4.—Our present Decree will come into operation on the fifth day after its publication in the Official Gazette.

ROYAL DECREE of the 28th February 1877, containing Regulations concerning the Removal of Cattle, Sheep, Goats, &c.

Article 1.—In those districts to be indicated by our Minister of the Interior by an announcement in the Official Gazette, it is forbidden to remove, or to cause to be removed, any live cattle, sheep, or goats without a permit given by the burgomaster of the commune in which the cattle are. In the permit must be stated the number and species of the animals which it is proposed to remove, the route by which they are to be forwarded to their place of destination, and also the time during which the permit is to remain valid. It must not be given by the burgomaster except in the following cases :—

1st. For the removal of animals to the slaughter-house.

2nd. Because of the change of residence of the owner or person in charge of the cattle.

3rd. For the removal of cattle by the buyer at a public sale.

If the removal extends to another commune, the burgomaster who issues the permit is to send a copy of it to the burgomaster of the commune whither the removal shall extend.

Article 2.—Whenever the person in charge of the cattle removing is unprovided with a permit for their removal, or when the removal is by another route or at another time than that prescribed in the removal permit, the cattle shall be detained, and a *procès-verbal* shall be made against the person in charge.

The slaughtering of cattle mentioned in the preceding Article, under Clause 1, is to take place

place under the supervision of the police, within a time to be fixed by the burgomaster of the commune in which the cattle are after their removal.

Article 3.—The holding of markets and public sales of all cattle, in so far as they may be allowed by the local regulations, is prohibited in those communes which may be indicated by our Minister of the Interior, by means of a notice in the Official Gazette.

The public sale of cattle belonging to the same owner, or forming part of the estate of a deceased person, continues to be allowed.

Article 4.—Our present Decree will come into operation on the fifth day after its publication in the Official Gazette.

ABSTRACT of the LAW of the 20th of July 1870, regulating the Government Supervision of Cattle and Veterinary Police. 131.

Article 1.—The Government supervision of cattle includes—

a. Inquiry as to the general condition of the animals, and, when necessary, the application of means for its improvement.

b. Enforcement of the laws and regulations enacted.

Article 2.—Appointment of district veterinary inspectors by the Minister of the Interior.

Article 3.—Oath to be taken by the veterinary officers.

Article 4.—Suspension of appointment of veterinary officers.

Article 5.—Power of district inspectors to enter all places within their district, fields, stables, and other places where cattle are kept, slaughter-houses, shops or places where meat is kept, zoological gardens, exhibition of cattle flayers, tripe dressers' shops, and all similar places, with or without the consent of the owners.

Article 6.—Reports to be made up by the district inspectors and sent in to the proper authority.

Article 7.—District inspectors to have a fixed salary, together with payment of office and travelling expenses. They are not to follow any other employment. Other inspectors can practise on their own account, and do not have a fixed salary.

Article 8.—Yearly reports to be sent in before the 1st of April in each year.

Article 9.—District inspectors keep an accurate account of the condition of the cattle within their district, and see to the due application of the laws and regulations made with respect to them, and countersign the diplomas and certificates of the veterinary surgeons.

They are to visit markets where the trade in cattle is carried on, and places where public sales of cattle are held, and order the detention and isolation of all cattle suffering from a contagious disease.

Article 10.—On any disease occurring among the cattle, or in case there may be reason to suppose that any cattle disease might be imported from abroad, immediate notice is to be given to the Minister of the Interior, to the Governor of the province, and to the district inspectors in the neighbouring places. When any such disease appears in their district, they shall make themselves personally acquainted with its nature, and propose such measures to the burgomaster as may be immediately taken for the suppression of the disease.

Article 11.—On the occurrence of cattle disease, temporary district inspectors may be appointed.

Article 12.—Report to be made by the Minister of the Interior every year; this report to be communicated to the States General.

Article 13.—On signs of contagious disease appearing, the owner or person having charge of the animal or animals to give immediate notice to the burgomaster of the commune in which the cattle is.

Article 14.—Affected animals to be immediately separated by the owner, and to be kept separated until the burgomaster in consultation with the district veterinary officer shall have decided on the measures to be taken.

Article 15.—Whenever it may be thought advisable, in consequence of the occurrence of any contagious disease in the country or abroad, the importation and transit of cattle may be prohibited; also, all movement of cattle, living or dead, and transport of meat, hides, hair, wool, manure and offal, fodder, instruments and things used in connection with cattle, may be stopped, and the holding of markets, exhibitions, &c., of cattle prohibited, and regulations made as to the matters mentioned in this article.

Appendix, No. 9.

Article 16.—On notice of any contagious cattle disease being given by the owner or person in charge, or when an animal may be suspected of suffering from any contagious disease, the burgomaster shall immediately order an investigation or inspection of the animals attacked or which may be supposed to be suffering from any disease, the investigations to be made by the district veterinary officer, or, in his absence, by the substitute veterinary inspector, or if necessary, in order to save time, by any duly qualified veterinary surgeon; report in writing is to be made to the burgomaster, and if the disease be of a contagious nature, the veterinary officer shall propose the measures to be taken with a view of checking the spread of the disease, and the burgomaster shall immediately cause such measures to be enforced.

Article 17.—At the direction of the burgomaster, who shall, if possible, take the advice of the district veterinary officer, or in his absence, and in that of the substitute veterinary authority, the advice of any qualified veterinary surgeon, the place, stall, or field in which any head of cattle affected with a contagious disease, or suspected of being so affected, is or may have been, shall have a distinct sign set upon it, by or in the presence of an officer of police; the sign employed for this purpose shall remain where it is placed for a time to be determined by the burgomaster in consultation with the district veterinary officer, but which shall not exceed 100 days after the termination of the last case.

Article 18.—The material, form, and size of the signs to be employed, to be determined by the Minister of the Interior, and published in the Official Gazette.

Article 19.—It shall be the duty of the burgomaster, with the advice of the district veterinary officer, or in his absence and in that of the substitute veterinary authority in urgent cases, on the advice of any qualified veterinary surgeon, to cause any cattle affected by or suspected of a contagious disease, or after its recovery therefrom, to be distinctly marked.

Article 20.—Instruments for marking cattle and the signs ordered in pursuance of Article 17, to be provided in every commune at the expense of the Government.

Article 21.—Removal of cattle affected with or suspected of a contagious disease is prohibited; should, however, such removal be necessary, the burgomaster may allow it to take place after taking the advice of the veterinary authority, and with the observance of the precautions recommended by such authority.

Article 22.—Cattle is held to be suspected whenever the district veterinary officer may observe in it the signs of a contagious disorder, whenever it can have been in contact with contagious matter, or may have been in the same place with an animal affected with contagious disease, or may have been in such place within a period to be determined in accordance with Article 34, or has been in immediate contact with such animal.

Article 23.—All orders for the slaughtering or detention of cattle to be made by the burgomaster on the report of the verterinary officer.

Article 24.—Compensation to be made for cattle ordered to be slaughtered.

An expert to be appointed by the burgomaster for the purpose of valuing the cattle; the full value of the cattle, if in a healthy condition, to be given for suspected animals, and for animals affected with a contagious disorder, the half of such value. For the purpose of compensation, cattle shall be considered as affected or suspected, according to its condition at the moment of its being taken possession of by the burgomaster.

The remainder of this article contains provisions for the settlement of differences as to the value of the cattle ordered for slaughter.

Article 25.—The provisions of Articles 23 and 24 to be applied to all articles destroyed on the recommendation of the veterinary authority.

Article 26.—Fixes the time within which the claim for compensation remains in force, and the deposit of monies awarded in compensation, but not accepted as sufficient by the owner of the cattle slaughtered, or articles destroyed.

Article 27.—The claim for compensation is forfeited in cases where notice has not been given as required by Article 13, or the separation of the animals as required by Article 14 has been neglected, or in case the owner shall have taken his cattle within the prohibited period into stalls or fields, or other places in which a contagious disease has prevailed, or shall in any way purposely have caused his cattle to become suspected.

Article 28.—Prescribes the method of payment of the amounts required for compensation, and the mode in which the accounts are to be sent in.

Article 29.—If considered necessary by the district veterinary officer, all infected places to be isolated; the military power may be called into aid in effecting this object. The clothes of persons coming from an infected place to be disinfected.

Article 30.—Dogs may be ordered to be detained in infected places.

Article 31.—Instructions as to destruction, by burning or otherwise, of cattle slaughtered in pursuance of this law, or which may have died from any infectious disease, and of other objects,

objects, and also as to the disinfection of stables and other buildings, and of manure-pits, issued by Royal Decree to be observed. Appendix, No. 9.

(Instructions issued in pursuance of this article will be found in the law of the 4th of December 1870).

Article 32.—No cattle to be introduced into pastures or places where any contagious disease has prevailed, until the expiration of a period of time, the length of which shall be specially determined for each disease.

Article 33.—The burgomaster, accompanied or not by such persons as he may consider necessary, may enter the pastures, stables, and dwelling places of the owners or keepers of cattle for the purposes of this law, or of the decrees issued in pursuance thereof.

Article 34.—A schedule of diseases to be considered contagious to be issued by Royal Decree, whereby also shall be determined what measures contained in this law shall be applied on the breaking out or threatening of each of such diseases.

Articles 35 to 41.—Penalties.

Articles 42 to 46 (the end).—Definitions, &c., and laws repealed.

ABSTRACT of Regulations respecting the burying, burning, or otherwise destroying of Cattle, which have been slaughtered according to the Law of the 20th of July 1870 (Act No. 131), or which have died of a Contagious Disease, and of other objects; and the Disinfection of Stables and other Buildings, and of Manure Pits:— 191.

No. 191.—4 December 1870.

Sect. 1. Destruction of Infected Articles by means of Burning or Burying.

Infected hay, straw, reeds, dry manure, wooden flooring, if in bad condition, old woodwork, strongly infected clothing, and other objects not suitable for disinfection, to be burned, or if this be dangerous, buried.

Animals dying of, or slaughtered in consequence of, cattle plague or sheep-pox, more especially to be burned, or when the locality does not allow of burial.

The things to be burned are collected together with the upper layer of the road along which they have been brought, and are placed in a pit; and after having a sufficient quantity of pitch and petroleum poured over them are set on fire. The ash, or what may remain, is buried to the depth of a meter. In burying without burning, the cattle are cut open, the hide is rendered valueless by being slashed; it is then placed in a pit with pitch, petroleum, or with a layer of quicklime, at least one decimeter thick, over it; on this are placed the manure, hay, and straw to be buried; and over all a layer of earth one meter thick; the place is, if necessary, surrounded by a thick fence, sufficient to keep out all cattle, and is to be kept fenced in for one year.

Sect. 2. Disinfecting Infected Articles.

The disinfection of infected articles is effected by first scraping them, and then scrubbing them with boiling water, to be followed by the process mentioned in Sect. 3.

Sect. 3. Destruction of Contagious Matter.

The destruction of contagious matter is effected by exposing the infected articles to a current of air, or to a high temperature, or by the application of disinfectants. The district inspector decides which of these means shall be employed.

The most usual disinfectants employed are chlorine or chloride of lime, sulphuric acid, or carbolic acid.

Stalls and sheds to be disinfected by means of chloride of lime, with or without whitewash; chloride of lime to be put in pans in infected sheds.

Sulphuric acid fumes to be used for disinfecting hides, wool, and similar articles.

Disinfecting of persons is effected by the careful washing of the hands and face with soap and water, and is, as a rule, confined to the outer garments; special care being taken with the disinfection of boots or shoes. The underclothing to be disinfected if necessary; this may be so in the case of persons employed in the slaughter of infected animals.

Cotties infected by blood or excretion from the mouth are washed in boiling soap and water; or if not adapted for this treatment, or are of little value, they are burned. The shoes to be carefully washed with a solution of carbolic acid.

Sheds and other buildings are first cleansed from manure. The manure to be removed with all necessary precautions, and disinfected or buried in the neighbourhood of the building.

Appendix, No. 9.

All articles not suitable for disinfection, such as old flooring, woodwork, &c., to be broken down and burned or buried. (Indemnification according to Art. 25 of the Law of 20 July 1870, No. 131.)

Walls and flooring to be then carefully scraped and scrubbed with boiling water, and afterwards washed with solution of carbolic acid; and after this has drained off, the whole to be subjected to strong vapour of chlorine.

The places submitted to chlorine vapours to remain closed up for at least six hours; after which they are to be exposed to a free current of air.

Fire proof objects to be submitted to a red heat.

Manure pits:—

1. To be disinfected with an abundant quantity of water containing carbolic acid, or if preferable, by means of chloride of lime.

2. By being ploughed in.

---

194. ROYAL DECREE of 8th December 1870, respecting the Prohibition of the Importation and Transit from Foreign Countries of Cattle, Sheep and Goats, Fresh Hides, Fresh and Salted Meat, Unmelted Fat, Manure, Unmanufactured Wool, Unmanufactured Hair, Hoofs and Horns, also of all Offal of the said Animals.

Article 1.—The importation and transit from foreign countries of cattle, sheep, and goats, and of fresh hides, fresh and salted meat, unmelted fat, manure, unmanufactured wool, unmanufactured hair, hoofs, horns, and of all other offal of the said animals are prohibited.

Article 2.—This prohibition does not apply to salted meat, wool, hair, horns, and hoofs, brought direct from countries beyond Europe.

Article 3.—Whenever any special cause shall render necessary any modification of the terms of this Decree, our Minister of the Interior is authorised to make such modifications, taking all necessary precautions against the transmitting of infection, and with the co-operation of our Minister of Finance.

Article 4.—This Decree will come into operation on the 1st January 1871.

---

42. ROYAL DECREE of the 28th May 1871, containing the Prohibition of the loading of Cattle on Board a Ship destined for Abroad, without a previous Inspection by a Veterinary Surgeon appointed thereto by the Government.—Taking into consideration, that in contravention of the 21st Article of the Law of the 20th July 1870, exportation of cattle suffering from lung disease, has taken place at Rotterdam, by steamboats destined for foreign countries, and that the inspection of outward-bound cattle before going on board is thus rendered necessary, we have willed and decreed as follows:—

Article 1.—It is prohibited to ship, or to offer for shipping, any cattle on board any vessel destined for foreign countries, without a previous inspection by a veterinary surgeon appointed thereto by the Government. The inspection shall take place by day only, between sunrise and sunset.

Article 2.—Our Decree shall come into operation on the fifth day after its publication in the Official Gazette.

---

104. ROYAL DECREE of the 19th October 1871, respecting the Transport of Cattle by Railway, and the disinfecting of Cattle-trucks.

Article 1.—The transport of cattle by railway may be effected only by means of trucks used exclusively for that purpose.

Article 2.—Cattle-trucks entering from foreign countries must be cleansed and disinfected at the frontier station, under the care of the railway company concerned, with observance of paragraphs 2 and 3 of the instructions appended to our decree of the 4th December 1870—(191).

Article 3.—Our present Decree shall come into operation on the fifth day after its publication in the Official Gazette.

ABSTRACT.

DECREE of the 30th of October 1872, stating which cattle diseases are to be considered contagious, and indicating which of the measures mentioned in the law of 20th of July 1870 are to be applied on the breaking out or threatening of each of such diseases.

Article 1.—The following are held to be contagious diseases of cattle:—

1. Cattle plague in ruminating animals.
2. Lung disease in horned cattle.
3. Malignant foot disease in sheep.
4. Glanders and in
5. Scab in horses and sheep.
6. Sheep-pox.
7. Splenitis in all cattle.
8. Rabies in all cattle.

Article 2.—Articles 13 and 14 of the Law of the 20th of July 1870 (Art. No. 131), are applicable to all the diseases mentioned in Article 1. Cattle suspected to be suffering from a contagious disease can be ordered by the burgomaster to be isolated after consultation with the district veterinary officer, his substitute, or in the absence of these, and in urgent cases, with a qualified veterinary surgeon.

Article 3.—Besides the notice and separation directed by Articles 13 and 14, the following measures are to be applied:—

Sect. 1. Cattle Plague.

Cattle suffering from or suspected of cattle plague shall be slaughtered, and afterwards burnt or buried.

The stable or building where cattle suffering from, or suspected of, cattle plague have been, shall be disinfected.

The manure on the farm or place shall be disinfected.

Dogs may be ordered to be detained.

Sect. 2. Lung Disease.

Cattle attacked by lung disease shall be slaughtered; the internal organs shall be burnt or buried; the hides of the animals slaughtered shall be disinfected.

The place in the stall, or the building where an animal which has been slaughtered or has died has stood, shall be disinfected.

Dogs may be ordered to be detained.

Our Minister of the Interior can suspend the slaughtering in particular districts, and for certain times, and can order the slaughtering of suspected animals.

Owners of cattle suffering from lung disease are authorised to slaughter such animals, after having given notice to the burgomaster, and under the direction of the police; they shall, notwithstanding, observe the remaining stipulations of the law referred to, and of this Decree.

Sect. 3. Malignant Foot Disease in Sheep.

Sheep suffering from this disease shall be separated from the others.

Sect. 4. Glanders.

Should the district veterinary officer consider it necessary, the animal attacked shall be slaughtered, and the body burned or buried.

The place in the stable or other building where the animal has been shall be disinfected.

Sect. 5. Scab.

Horses or sheep affected with scab shall be separated from the others.

Sect. 6. Sheep-pox.

In special cases where it may be considered necessary by the district veterinary authority, sheep suffering from sheep-pox may be slaughtered.

The body shall be burned or buried.

If slaughtering has not been applied, the sheep attacked shall be kept separate from the others.

The stable or other building in which a sheep suffering from sheep-pox has been, shall be disinfected after the termination of the last case.

Sect. 7. Splenitis.

Separation and disinfecting of the place.

Appendix, No. 9.

Sect. 8. Rabies.

Cattle attacked with rabies to be slaughtered, and the body burned or buried.
The place to be disinfected.
Dogs to be detained.

Article 4.—Cattle dying of a contagious disease shall be burned or buried by and at the cost of the owner.
The tar, petroleum, or quicklime necessary shall be provided by the burgomaster at the expense of Government.

Article 5.—Cattle considered as suspected according to the Law of the 20th July 1870, Article 22, remains in that condition.

For lung disease, 3 months.
For malignant foot disease in sheep, 15 days.
For glanders and , 30 days.
For scab in horses, 15 days; and for scab in sheep, 1 day.
For sheep-pox, 15 days.
For splenitis, 8 days.
For rabies in sheep, goats, and swine, 2 months.
For rabies of cattle and single-hoofed animals, 6 months.

To be reckoned from the termination of the last, by recovery, or from the death or slaughter.

* * * * * *

In the case of cattle suspected of lung disease, the period of three months can be diminished by one month, in case the district veterinary officer, or his deputy, shall declare in writing, that within eight days of its having been declared suspected, it has been successfully inoculated by a qualfied veterinary surgeon.

* * * * * *

---

135 ROYAL DECREE of the 3rd October 1873, containing provisions respecting the Inspection, making Returns and Removal of Cattle, and the Prohibition of Markets and Public Sales of Cattle, with the object of checking the Spread of Lung Disease in Cattle.

Article 1.—It is forbidden to remove horned cattle out of or into those communes or parts of communes which may be specified by our Minister of the Interior. This announcement is to be made generally known by publication in the Official Gazette.
In special cases, the burgomaster can grant permission for such removal, after taking the opinion of the district veterinary surgeon, and on the conditions which may be considered necessary by him.

Article 2.—The holding of markets and public sales of cattle, although allowed by communal regulations, is forbidden in these communes which may have been notified by our Minister of the Interior by publication in the Official Gazette. Public sales of cattle belonging to one owner or forming part of the estate of a deceased person are still permitted.

Article 3.—In the communes or parts of communes referred to in Article 1, all the horned cattle shall be registered by inspectors.
These inspectors shall be appointed or dismissed by our Minister of the Interior. Before entering upon their duties, the inspectors must take the following oath or declaration before the burgomaster of the commune, assigned to them as their place of residence:—
"I swear (or promise) that I will properly perform the duties belonging to the office of inspector of cattle. So truly help me God Almighty."

Article 4.—The inspector shall make, in duplicate, lists of the cattle belonging to each owner, in which lists the cattle shall be numbered and described. These lists must be signed by the owners, or in their absence, by the keepers or herdsmen in whose charge the cattle may be; one copy is to be sent to the burgomaster.

Article 5.—The owner or person in charge of the cattle must, within 24 hours, give notice, in accordance with the provisions of Article 1, to the burgomaster, of every change that may have taken place with regard to the number of the cattle specified in the lists, in consequence of calving, death, slaughtering, or removal from one place to another within the commune, or part of the commune, and the burgomaster make a note thereof on the copy of the list which has been deposited with him.

Article 6.—Immediately and within 12 hours after the death or slaughtering of any head of cattle, the owner, keeper, or herdsman in charge must give notice thereof to the inspector, who must examine the animal which has died, or which has been slaughtered within 24 hours after the notification.
Until this inspection has taken place, it is forbidden to detach the lungs or to remove any portion of the animal.

Article 7.—The inspectors are bound to examine at least once a week all the cattle mentioned in the lists made out by them, and to compare the cattle with those lists. All such

such changes as are mentioned in Article 5 shall be immediately noted on the lists, and signed by the owners, keepers, or herdsmen as having been shown to him. If the inspectors in the course of this examination, or that mentioned in Article 6, suspect that any head of cattle is, or has been suffering from long disease, or should they detect any unauthorised change in the total number, they shall in the first case give immediate notice to the burgomaster, who shall act as prescribed in the Law of the 20th July 1870, and in the last case, they shall draw up, on oath, a *procès-verbal* of the infraction.

The Law of the 20th July 1870 (Official Gazette No. 131), for the regulation of Government inspection of cattle and veterinary police. From Article 34 of this Law, resulted (*see* p. 51 of Veterinary Report of Privy Council)—

The Royal Decree of 30th October 1872 (Official Gazette, No. 105), stating the diseases which are to be considered contagious, and the measures to be adopted with respect thereto, according to Section 2. Sections 13 and 14 of No. 131 are applicable to all cattle diseases mention in Clause 1 of 165. Clauses 13 and 14 of 131 are to the effect that the owner shall give immediate notice of the appearance of any cattle disease to the burgomaster, and cattle (Article 14) shall be kept isolated until the measures decreed by that authority shall have been applied (these measures fixed by No. 105, Article 3).

Another result of the Law No. 131 (Article 31) is the Royal Decree of 4th December 1870, No. 191, pointing out the methods to be adopted for the destruction or disinfection of cattle slaughtered on account of contagious disease, and of other objects; and the disinfection of stables and other buildings, and the rendering inocuous of manure-pits; infected hay, straw, reeds, dry manure, wooden flooring (if in bad condition), old lattice-work, strongly-infected clothes, and other objects unsuitable for disinfection, to be burned, or if this should be dangerous, buried. Animals dying of, or slaughtered in consequence of, cattle plague, or sheep-pox more especially, to be burned, or, when the locality does not allow, of burial.

The things to be burned are collected together, with the upper layer of the road along which they have been brought, and are placed in a pit, and after having a sufficient quantity of pitch and petroleum poured over them, are set on fire. The ash or what may remain is buried to the depth of a meter.

In burying without burning, the cattle are cut open, the hide is rendered valueless by being slashed, it is then placed in a pit with pitch, petroleum, or with a layer of quick-lime at least one decimeter thick over it; on this are placed the manure, hay, and straw to be buried, and over all a layer of earth one meter thick; the place is, if necessary, surrounded by a thick fence sufficient to keep out all cattle, and is to be kept fenced in for one year.

In cases of *Lung Disease*, Article 3 Sect. 2 of 105, 30th October 1872, animals affected must be slaughtered; lungs and other internal parts to be burned or buried (for method, *see* above). The hides are disinfected; the place where an animal having had lung disease has been, to be disinfected.

Dogs can be detained.

By Decree of 3rd February 1877, No. 17 (repealing decree of 17th April 1874, mentioned in Veterinary Report, p. 53), it is directed that on an animal being attacked by lung disease, the owner is obliged to have all his cattle which may in consequence become suspected inoculated by a properly qualified veterinary surgeon; 50 cents. (10 *d.*) to be paid to cover the cost. Should the owner not immediately carry out this regulation, the inoculation to be done by the burgomaster; (further, the same as the repealed Decree of 17th April 1874). In addition, to many places, slaughtering of the whole herd, among which lung disease may have shown itself, has been resorted to; by this means the number of cases in Friesland and some other provinces has been much reduced. The return of lung disease for the four weeks, 22nd April to 19th May of this year, is as follows: in Guelderland, 4 cases; South Holland, 87; Friesland, 9; total, 100 cases. All the other provinces were free from the disease. It is hoped that by a more general application of this measure, coupled with inoculation and isolation, the disease may eventually be eradicated. The amount expended this year up to the 15th of May has been 416,967 *f.* (34,700 *l.*), namely, 51,244 *f.* 50 *c.* for affected animals, and 365,722 *f.* 50 *c.* for suspected animals. It is considered at the present moment that there is no herd affected with lung disease in the province of Friesland. In South Holland the slaughter of suspected animals has only been partially applied. In that part of the province where the disease is known to exist, there are at present 41 affected herds in the pastures, where they are entirely isolated, and may not be removed so long as they are to be considered to be in a suspected condition; that is to say, for a period of three months after the termination of the last case. (Article 5 of D., 30 October 1872, 105.) I may mention that the opinion expressed at page 11 of the Annual Report of the Veterinary Department for 1876, that pleuro-pneumonia is not spread by "mediate contagion," appears not to be shared by the veterinary body in the Netherlands, at all events not by the head of the Veterinary Department there; it is there considered that a person going from an affected herd to a healthy herd may convey the disease to the latter. This may lead to a modification of the opinion stated at page 22 of the Report, namely, that on this subject there are no doubtful points to be considered.

Appendix, No. 10.

PAPERS handed in by Mr. *C. L. Peel*, on behalf of the Swedish and Norwegian Consul General.

Appendix, No. 10. REGULATIONS for Importation and Export of Cattle adopted in *Sweden* with reference to Contagious Diseases in Domestic Animals.

SWEDEN, more than most other European countries, has been free from contagious diseases amongst domestic animals, or epizootic. With the exception of the epizootic, which between 1720 and 1740 raged amongst the cattle in the south of Sweden, and which at the time certainly was called cattle plague, but which, according to the descriptions extant was splenic apoplexy, the epizootic has only very rarely appeared, and then again only within very narrow limits, to which, through proper measures, it has been possible to confine it.

The disease which is now called cattle plague has *never* appeared in Sweden. Contagious pleuro-pneumonia of cattle has, after having been introduced from England, shown itself twice, namely, in 1847 and 1856, but through energetic measures it was stopped, so that no case has since happened.

Of the other infectious diseases some single cases of splenic apoplexy have appeared, as well as of sheep-pox and foot-and-mouth disease, the last mentioned having been introduced through cattle landed from a stranded ship; only few cases of disease or death therefrom have, however, happened before the disease has been stamped out.

The reasons for this favourable state of things are various. The frontiers of the country are in part consisting of uninhabited mountain districts, through which but few roads lead on which the traffic may very easily be controlled, but chiefly of the sea-shore. By this it has been possible to limit the importation of cattle to some few ports, a circumstance which again has made possible a careful inspection of the state of health of the imported animals. This importation, moreover, is very small, and consists chiefly of cattle for breeding purposes.

There are no roads in the country along which cattle can be transported in transit.

If these circumstances have already before been found of weight, this must still more be the case now, when suitable and severe laws, accompanied with regulations for their being adhered to, have of late years been made to prevent the introduction of cattle diseases from other countries, as well as to make possible that they are speedily stamped out and prevented from spreading, if, notwithstanding all precautions, they should break out in the country.

These laws are contained in—

I. Royal Decree of 30th May 1873; and

II. Royal Decree of 19th April 1875;

translations of which laws are given below.

In addition to this the Board of Health has published directions and advice, which have been distributed amongst the communes (parishes) and the veterinary and civil authorities in many thousands of copies.

III. Extract of this publication is also given below.

I.—ROYAL DECREE of 30 May 1873, concerning Importation of Cattle and various Goods.

Paragraphs, 1–3. As soon as it has been ascertained that cattle plague or any other infectious disease in domestic animals has appeared in any foreign country, public notice is to be given and circulated as widely as possible, to the effect that the country in question is *infected*.

The proper authorities are empowered to declare any country *suspected* in which no such disease is known to exist but through which it may be imported.

Paragraph 4. Importation by sea of oxen, sheep, &c., and of horses, must not take place except

except in places where authorised veterinary surgeons are found; at the commencement of each year lists shall be published of such places where the above-mentioned kinds of cattle may be imported.

Paragraph 5. All importations of any kind of cattle, either by sea or by land, from any foreign country or district which has been duly declared *infected* by cattle plague is absolutely prohibited.

Regarding the treatment of cattle which, although arriving from a healthy place, has within the last four months preceding the exportation been in contact with any infected place, *vide* paragraph 4.

Paragraph 6. Importation of cattle from foreign country or district, according to paragraph 3, has been declared *suspected* of being infected with cattle plague, is permitted only on the following conditions:—

(*a*) Every herd of cattle must be accompanied by a certificate, showing that within the last four months preceding the exportation, it has neither been attacked by cattle plague, nor been in contact with any place infected with malignant disease.

(*b*) On arriving to the Swedish place of importation every herd of cattle must, before being landed, be duly examined by an authorised veterinary surgeon, and declared free from any infectious disease.

In order to be valid the certificates above mentioned must be either issued or duly attested by the Consul for Sweden, or by some other public authority at the place of exportation.

Paragraph 7. If a country has been declared infected, not with cattle plague, but with some other infectious disease, importation of the kind of animals which suffer from that disease is allowed only if *every herd of animals* is supplied with a certificate issued by proper authority (*vide* paragraph 6), indicating the marks by which the individual animal may be recognised, and showing that it has not been suffering from the disease in question, or been near any infected place. A certificate delivered by a veterinary surgeon at the place of shipping, to the effect that the animals were healthy at the departure is also required, and, finally, the animals are to be inspected by an authorised veterinary surgeon before being landed.

If the foreign place from which the animals have arrived is declared infected with pleuro-pneumonia, splenitis, glanders, pox, foot-and-mouth disease, scab in sheep, or hydrophobia, the animals are to remain isolated from other domestic animals during the three next following months at the place of importation, or at the place of destination, and must be inspected by a veterinary surgeon once a month, or more, if necessary.

Paragraph 8. Any animal which at the inspection, mentioned in paragraphs 6 and 7, is found to be infected with cattle plague, pleuro-pneumonia, splenitis, glanders, pox, or hydrophobia, must be slaughtered immediately. Any other animal infected with some other malignant disease must also be slaughtered or re-exported without being previously brought on shore.

If, as above stated, any animal on its arrival is found suffering from some malignant disease, or if on board vessels carrying animals any case of such disease has happened during the voyage, all other animals which have arrived in the same vessel, and which are liable to suffer from the same disease, must be slaughtered or re-exported without being landed. Should, however, the disease not be the cattle plague the animals suspected of infection may, if their owner wishes it, and the veterinary surgeon does not consider it dangerous, be kept in an isolated locality near the place of unloading during a period of three months, under the special supervision of a veterinary surgeon, and with due observance of all other precautions necessary in order to prevent the spreading of the disease.

Should, at this inspection, symptoms appear which render the animals fairly suspected of being infected with any malignant disease, such animal, as well as others which have arrived in the same vessel and are liable to the same disease, must be immediately re-exported without being landed, unless the owner prefer to keep them at the place of unloading under the supervision of the veterinary surgeon, as above stated, or else to allow those animals which are considered specially suspected to be slaughtered, in order to ascertain their real state. Should these animals at the dissection be found free from infection, the other animals may be imported, on condition of being kept under veterinary supervision at the place of destination, as stated in paragraph 7. But should any of the animals slaughtered be found infected, all the others must be likewise slaughtered or re-exported without being landed.

Paragraph 9. (Concerning cases of illness occurring amongst animals placed under quarantine, according to paragraphs 7 and 8.)

Paragraphs 10–12. (Concerning notices of expected consignment of animals and removals from the harbour of arrival, &c.)

Paragraph 13. From any foreign country or district which has been duly declared infected with cattle plague all importation of fresh meat, unmelted tallow, entrails or blood of cattle, sheep, goats, and other ruminants; also of fodder (hay or straw), and of wool, hair, horn, hoofs, undressed hides and skins of the above-mentioned animals is absolutely prohibited.

This applies to the above-mentioned articles not only when exported directly from an infected place, but also when such merchandise arrives from a healthy place but has been produced at or sent from or through an infected one.

Appendix, No. 10.

Paragraph 14. Wool, hair, horn, hoofs, undressed hides and skins of ruminants produced at a healthy place, but transmitted through or sent from an infected one, may be imported on the following conditions :—

1st. That the importation by sea takes place in one of the following towns : Gothenburg, Halmstad, Hellingborg, Landskrona, Malmoe, Ystad, Solvesborg, Karlshamn, Karlskrona, Wisby, Kalmar, Oskarshamn, Westervill, Nowkoping, Gefle, Sundswale, Hernosaud, or Umeo;

2nd. That a certificate, issued according to the rules in paragraph 6, showing the place of production, is exhibited before the goods are unshipped ; and,

3rd. That the goods, before delivered to the owners, are submitted to some treatment calculated to annihilate any infection.

If wool, during the transit through or contact with any infected place, has remained packed in, so called, "original bales," or if merchandise of any of the above-mentioned kinds have been inclosed in wooden or tin cases, boxes, &c., which may be considered impenetrable to infection, or packed in bags or other sufficiently close material, which on the arrival are found quite undamaged, the merchandise itself need not be disinfected, but all the covers and packing must be subjected to disinfection.

Paragraph 15. (Concerning importation of wool, which, having been subjected to so-called factory washing, is supposed to have been disinfected thereby ; importation of such wool is permitted under certain strict conditions.)

Paragraph 16. All importations of fresh meat, unmelted tallow, entrails, or blood of any kind of ruminants ; also of hay, straw, and other fodder, from any foreign country or district declared suspected of cattle plague is absolutely prohibited. Importation of wool, hair, horns, hoofs, undressed hides and skins (*vide* paragraph 13) is permitted only by sea, in the towns enumerated in paragraph 14 ; on their arrival such merchandise must be accompanied by a certificate showing that the place of production is healthy, and that they have not been into contact with any place infected during the transit.

If not accompanied by such certificate, the merchandise are considered produced at an infected place, but the Board of Customs may decide on what condition the merchandise may be imported, if it can otherwise be rendered probable that they have been produced at a healthy place.

In the absence of a certificate showing that the merchandise during the transit from the place of production to the port of shipping has not passed through an infected place, the merchandise must be disinfected, as stated in paragraph 14.

These certificates (*vide* paragraph 6) must indicate the marks on the merchandise.

Exception from this rule is made for vessels with a cargo of wool, hair, horn, hoofs, undressed hides or skins from a trans-atlantic country, which, according to the ship journal, or other trustworthy evidence, have tendered only at such European ports which at the time of their stay there were considered healthy. Should this not be sufficiently proved, or should there be some special reason to suppose the merchandise to have been in contact with some infected place, they must be disinfected according to paragraph 14.

Paragraph 17. Before merchandise are disinfected great care must be taken that they are not brought into contact with animals susceptible to cattle plague, or with other merchandise of the kinds above stated; if disinfection cannot take place on board or immediately after the unloading, the merchandise must be kept isolated under the supervision of Customs officers.

Hay, straw, &c., in which any merchandise arriving from a place infected with cattle plague is packed, must be burnt or disinfected at the clearing in the Custom House. Should this not take place, the Customs officer should enjoin the owner or agent employed to destroy such hay or straw.

Paragraphs 18 and 19. (Concerning the arrangements for necessary supervision, disinfection, &c.)

Paragraph 20. If during the voyage of a vessel arriving at a Swedish port, cattle plague or other infectious disease has broken out amongst animals during the voyage, or if the vessel has a cargo of animals or merchandise of such a description that the above-mentioned measures for the prevention of infection are obligatory at their importation, the vessel must be disinfected at the expense of the master, according to the prescription of the veterinary surgeon; if the vessel carries infected animals, all persons on board, and also animals not liable to infection, must be disinfected before being landed; the vessel to remain in quarantine until such disinfection has taken place.

When ruminants or merchandise (*vide* paragraph 13) arrives from a healthy place in a vessel which *either* at the same time brings such animals or merchandise from an infected place, *or* has had such cargo within 60 days previously without having been disinfected, the merchandise from the healthy place is to be disinfected according to paragraph 14, and the animals from the healthy place, if no case of cattle plague on board is reported, to be landed on condition that they are kept in quarantine near the landing-place during 10 days veterinary supervision.

Should

Should any case of infection arise in the meantime, the matter is to be treated according to paragraph 9. When after this period the animals are reported healthy, they will be restored to their owner. Appendix, No. 10

Paragraphs 21–24. (Concerning special cases.)

II.—Royal Decree of 19 April 1875, concerning Infectious Diseases amongst the Home Stock of Domestic Animals.

Paragraph 1. This Decree applies to the following diseases in domestic animals: splenitis, cattle plague, pleuro-pneumonia, glanders, pox in sheep, malignant foot disease in sheep, scab in sheep, and hydrophobia.

Should other diseases amongst domestic animals appear to be so infectious and malignant as to be comparable to those above enumerated, the Government will decide whether this Decree shall also apply to such disease.

Paragraph 2. (Concerning arrangements for supervision.)

Paragraph 3. (Provides for slaughter and dissection of suspected animals.)

Paragraphs 4 and 5. (Concerning preliminary steps in case of an outbreak of one of those diseases.)

Paragraph 6. When domestic animals are attacked by a disease which is found or suspected to be amongst those mentioned in paragraph 1, their owners must take care, in accordance with the injunction of the veterinary surgeon, that such animals are kept separate from all healthy animals in properly isolated localities, and also kept away from common pastures and watering places. Persons attending on the infected animals must not be in contact with the healthy ones, and no person who is not concerned must be permitted to approach near the infected animals, or any objects which has been in contact with them.

Animals infected or suspected of infection must not be removed from the farm where they were attacked by the disease, unless it is done for the purpose of separating such animals from the healthy ones with the consent of the veterinary surgeon.

If the diseased animals are suspected of suffering from cattle plague, the above rules shall apply also to all such horned cattle, sheep, goats, &c. as shall have been kept in the same farmyard, or frequented the same watering places or pastures as the diseased ones within the last 10 days previously. But if the disease is supposed to be pleuro-pneumonia, these rules shall apply only to horned cattle which are in that case.

Paragraph 7. (Concerning hydrophobia.)

Paragraph 8. Cattle suffering from cattle plague or pleuro-pneumonia, and horses which by a licensed veterinary surgeon is declared infected with glanders, must immediately be slaughtered according to the directions of the veterinary surgeon. Horned cattle, sheep, goats, and other ruminants which within 10 days have been kept in the same farmyards, or used the same watering places or pastures as the animals infected with cattle plague, must be treated in the same way, and also horned cattle which within the said period has been in contact with animals infected with pleuro-pneumonia as above stated.

Owners of animals slaughtered as above stated are entitled to compensation from public funds. For a horse found to be infected with glanders when slaughtered the compensation is half the value, and for a horse found *not* to be infected with glanders when slaughtered, the compensation is the full value of the animal.

If the above-stated diseases should increase so much that the General Board of Health and Governors of Provinces under such circumstances consider that the disease cannot be stopped through the slaughtering of the animals, it must at once be referred to the Government whether the slaughtering is to be proceeded with or not.

Paragraph 9. (Concerning compensation to owners.)

Paragraph 10. Animals which have died from a contagious disease, or have been slaughtered as above stated, must be interred whole, at a quite isolated place, unless the veterinary surgeon does consider that some parts of it might be used. When animal is interred without being skinned the skin must previously be cut to pieces, or otherwise rendered useless. The interment must take place at once, at the expense of the owner. Should he not possess a place proper for the interment, or if it has not been ascertained to whom the animal belonged, the sanitary or the local board must take the steps necessary for the interment. Other measures to prevent the spread of the disease through the process of the interment will be prescribed by the veterinary surgeon, if the Governor of the Province has not already ordered them to be taken.

Animals found dead on shore, or in the fields, must be interred with the skin as found, if suspected to have died from an infectious disease.

Paragraph 11. As soon as the Governor of the Province has received the veterinary report on the outbreak of an infectious disease amongst the domestic animals, he shall, through notifications to be published in the newspapers, read in the churches, and placarded

Appendix, No. 10.

at all convenient places, inform the public in his Province, of the localities where the disease has broken out, and he shall also decide how large a part of the Province must be declared infected, which will depend on the intensity and the spread of the disease.

He will also, on the advice of the veterinary surgeon, have to order such steps and measures, as, through the special character of the disease, may be necessary for the isolation of the infected animals, for the disinfection of persons and objects which have been in contact with them, and for the interment of the dead animals; and to prescribe the conditions on which domestic animals may be transmitted through an infected district, or exportation of live stock, or of slaughtered animals, or of part of such, from an infected district, may be permitted, and, finally, the precautions to be observed when animals are slaughtered for food.

If the Governor should deem it necessary, in order to prevent spreading of the infection, he is empowered to order one or more herds of cattle infected, or suspected of infection, to be placed under veterinary supervision, in which case the above-stated rules concerning infected districts are to be observed in so far as applicable.

If cattle plague exists in a district the Governor will cause fairs and other public meetings to be postponed, or held at other places, if necessary and convenient.

Whenever an infected district shall have been declared healthy by the veterinary authorities, and when special supervision of domestic animals, which has been ordered in accordance with the above rules is removed, the fact must be published by the Governor in the manner stated.

Paragraph 12. At the outbreak of cattle plague the houses, pasture grounds, or other places where diseased animals are kept, and also the surrounding neighbourhood to the extent prescribed by the veterinary surgeon, must be guarded. Has the cattle plague spread over a larger district, the roads, and streets leading to, or near, the locality where the disease exists must be guarded, in order to isolate the district. No animals liable to be attacked by cattle plague must be brought into such districts, nor may any ruminants, nor hay, straw, or manure, be exported from them. The Governor may also order stringent measures regarding the communication with other places, but without stopping the traffic, unless necessary.

(Here follow detailed regulations for effecting the necessary isolation.)

If any of the diseases enumerated in Paragraph 1 has assumed a considerable intensity, and threaten to spread rapidly, the Governor shall, on the advice of a veterinary surgeon, order the infected district to be strictly guarded, according to circumstances.

Paragraph 13. All persons who have been in contact with infected animals, or with objects touched by them, must carefully disinfect themselves and the clothes used on those occasions. As soon as the disease has ceased at a place which has been infected with cattle plague or other contagious diseases amongst domestic animals, the owner must at once cause all open spaces, stables, farms, or other places where the infected animals have been kept, and especially all wooden structures and all kind of implements, harness, carriages, and similar objects, with which the infected animals have been in contact, and also all healthy animals which might spread the infection, to be properly disinfected. Fodder, manure, refuse, and all other objects which may spread contagion, but which cannot themselves be disinfected, must be burnt, interred, or otherwise rendered harmless, according to the orders given by the Governor or the veterinary surgeon, in each separate case.

The disinfection must take place under the supervision of the veterinary surgeon, the local authorities, or the chief of the police, and until then no objects which are to be disinfected must be used, nor any healthy animals allowed to get into such place.

It must be specially observed at places where the cattle plague has existed, that the disinfection must comprise dressed and undressed hides, skins, wool, hair, horse-hair, and similar articles; and that within 10 days after the slaughter of the animals which were kept in the place no approach is to be allowed to the places where such animals were kept except for the purposes of the disinfection, and that no healthy animals must be brought into the premises before 20 days have elapsed since the infected animals were slaughtered.

Paragraphs 14–21. (Concerning fees, fines, and administrative details.)

III.--EXTRACT of a Publication by the Royal Board of Health, conveying Advice and Instruction for Communal Authorities, Veterinary Surgeons, and Royal Officials, concerning the mode of carrying out the Measures which have been prescribed in the Royal Decree of 19th April 1875, for preventing and arresting Contagious Diseases amongst Domestic Animals.

These instructions, as to the mode of proceedings at the examination, isolation, and slaughtering of diseased animals, and particularly concerning disinfection of farmyards, stables, and other places where animals infected with a contagious disease have been kept; of manure, implements, railway trucks and vessels; of hay, straw, and other fodder; of pastures, roads, spaces where the animals have been slaughtered; of living animals; of undressed hides, skins, hair, horse-hair, and similar articles; of wool blankets (linen and woollen), garments, shoes; and of persons; being necessarily framed with special regard to

to the peculiar customs and arrangements in Sweden, it has not been considered necessary to reproduce them, excepting one or two paragraphs. Appendix, No. 10

In the first paragraph concerning the veterinary examination of domestic animals, it is stated—

When domestic animals suspected to be infected with a contagious disease, or attacked by such disease, are to be examined, the veterinary surgeon must act with great care, in order to prevent the further spreading of the contagion through his negligence.

When therefore a herd of cattle is to be examined, it is necessary to inspect first the animals which seem to be healthy, and then those who seem to exhibit symptoms of disease.

The report of the veterinary surgeon on such proceedings should mention the name and place of abode of the owner. With regard to each animal examined, the report is to state to what kind it belongs, its special marks, age, the box it occupies in the stable or farmyard, and (when necessary, in order to inquire into the origin and spreading of the infection) how long the animal infected has been the property of the same owner, the locality from where it has arrived, whether more animals than those examined have been kept at the place during or shortly before the outbreak of the disease, and if so, when they have been removed; whether other animals in the meantime have been kept in the same stable, or else in contact with the infected animals, &c.

Finally, the veterinary surgeon must thoroughly report on the state of health of the examined animals, and the special symptoms which may exist. He must also make a detailed description not only of the external parts of the animals, but also of the functions of their special organs mentioned in a certain order (concerning the dissection, and report thereon).

Concerning the Isolation and Nursing of the Infected Animals.

With regard to animals recognised to suffer from one of the diseases specified in the laws of 1875, it is specially enacted that—

At the outbreak of one of those contagious diseases all the infected animals must be isolated from the healthy ones, and kept in separate houses or places well enclosed, and far from common watering places or pastures.

(Detailed Instructions for carrying out this Isolation.)

Animals infected or suspected of infection must not be removed from the place where they were attacked unless it is done with the consent of the veterinary surgeon, and for the more effective isolation of such animals from the healthy ones.

Neither must healthy animals liable to infection be brought to a place where the disease exists, or in the district which by the authorities has been declared infected.

Domestic animals belonging to a herd in which the disease has appeared and which are liable to infection, must not be sold or removed before the disease has disappeared, or the district, if already it has been declared infected, is reported free from infection.

SPECIAL INFORMATION relative to Live Stock in *Norway*, the Exportation and Importation of Horses, Cattle, Sheep, Goats, and Swine, and the Acts and Orders for the Suppression of Virulent Contagious Diseases among Domestic Animals. Furnished by His Norwegian Majesty's Secretary of State for the Home Department.

Number of Live Stock in *Norway* at the expiration of 1875.

Horses	151,903	Goats	323,364
Cattle	1,016,595	Swine	101,351
Sheep	1,686,806		

Live Stock imported into *Norway* in—

	1871.	1872.	1873.	1874.	1875.
Horses	19	116	364	635	239
Cattle	1,926	1,730	1,941	3,218	3,260
Sheep	917	993	1,411	2,982	1,817
Swine	11,111	8,624	8,093	9,749	7,097

Total for the quinquennial term:—Horses, 1,373; Cattle, 12,075; Sheep, 8,120; Swine, 44,674.

Appendix, No. 10

Live Stock exported from *Norway* in—

	1871.	1872.	1873.	1874.	1875.
Horses - - - - -	406	733	50	38	40
Cattle - - - - -	1,094	1,417	2,096	1,130	263
Sheep - - - - -	3,128	5,078	2,769	154	9
Swine - - - - -	34	20	—	—	—

Total for the quinquennial term:—Horses, 1,267; Cattle, 6,000; Sheep, 11,138; Swine, 54. These figures do not include live stock exported to or *viâ* Sweden.

For goats there are no special returns; both the importation and exportation of these animals is, however, believed to have been exceedingly limited.

The proportion in which the exportation and importation of live stock was distributed between the different countries is shown in the annexed Statement from the Norwegian Central Statistical Bureau (Appendix I.), whence it appears that the bulk of the exportation went to Great Britain and Ireland; very few animals were, on the other hand, imported into Norway from those countries.

The statement likewise shows that the exportation of live stock during the last few years has experienced a great decline. The bad harvest of 1876 having necessitated a considerable reduction of stock throughout the country generally, it is probable that the exportation of animals for some time to come will almost cease.

There is no duty on live stock, imported or exported.

The chief regulations for the suppression of virulent contagious diseases amongst animals are comprised in the Act of the 27th February 1866, and that of the 26th May 1877 (Appendix II.). The diseases to which, in pursuance of this Act, attention is specially directed, are *anthrax* and *typhus*, attacking domestic animals generally, the *cattle plague*, *pleuro-pneumonia* (bovine animals), *glanders* and *farcy* (horses), *sheep-pox* and *foot-and-mouth disease* (sheep), and *hydrophobia*.

The cattle plague is not known to have ever been detected in Norway; no case of pleuro-pneumonia has been heard of in this country since the winter of 1860-61, when there was an outbreak on the farm of the State Agricultural School at Aas, near the town of Drobak, in Akershu's Amt, infected cattle having been imported from Scotland. By the immediate slaughter of the animals and timely adoption of other energetic measures, the disease was, however, speedily stamped out, and its further propagation fortunately prevented. A case of hydrophobia is not known to have occurred in Norway for many years past. The other diseases enumerated above have broken out from time to time, but by a strict enforcement of the protective measures they were generally prevented from spreading; the outbreak being confined to the first few cases that occurred.

Section 2 of the Act empowers His Majesty the King, in the event of any other disease amongst domestic animals assuming an exceptionally virulent character, to extend the provisions of the Act to that disease also. This proved necessary some years since, a peculiarly virulent form of catarrhal fever having broken out amongst cattle in one or two parishes of Nodre Bergenhu's Amt, and a Royal Decree, bearing date 17th June 1872, was accordingly issued.

In pursuance of Section 3, the Amtmand is authorised to engage, at the public expense, a veterinary surgeon, who shall attend all horse and cattle fairs or shows, and repair to any place where domestic animals are congregated, for the effectual enforcement of the precautionary measures, should contagious disease be detected amongst them; and the Amtmand is, moreover, empowered to have all domestic animals, of a kind that may at any time be specially threatened with contagious disease, examined by a veterinary surgeon. It is forbidden, under a penalty, to drive or convey an animal known to be suffering from virulent contagious disease to such localities, or to any market or place of sale, or to seek to dispose of it there.

The preventive regulations laid down by the Act in the event of an outbreak of any one of the diseases specified above, consist chiefly in immediately calling in a veterinary surgeon, or by reporting the case without delay to the police, isolating the sick animals, and thoroughly disinfecting everything with which they have been in contact; furthermore, if the disease be cattle plague or pleuro-pneumonia, in slaughtering the infected animals, and, should it be deemed necessary, the whole stock; if glanders or farcy, in slaughtering the horses attacked.

For the rest the Act leaves it with His Majesty the King, or whomsoever His Majesty shall see fit to appoint (at present the Director of the Department of Civil Medicine), to issue special orders for the suppression of each disease, such special orders having already been issued for glanders and farcy (Appendix III.), anthrax (Appendix IV.), and virulent forms of foot-and-mouth disease (Appendix V.).

Provisions relating to indemnities claimable from the public treasury by owners of animals slaughtered compulsorily, and to the defrayment of expenses entailed in carrying into effect the repressive regulations, are contained in Sections 6, 7, and 9.

To

To guard against the importation of infected stock, Section 8 of the Act empowers His Majesty the King to prohibit the importation from countries in which contagious disease amongst animals is known to exist of cattle, horses, and live stock generally, of all raw produce furnished from such animals, and of implements and fodder assumed to be infectable; and His Majesty the King is moreover empowered, in the event of absolute prohibition being deemed unnecessary, to adopt special precautions against the introduction of contagious diseases from foreign countries through the medium of infected animals and infectable things.

In pursuance of this provision of the Act, a Royal Mandate, bearing date 18th March 1871, together with the decree of the 21st August 1874, and Royal Mandates issued on the 19th January, 7th February, and 4th May respectively, prohibit, until further notice, the importation from—

1. Austrian ports, ports of the German Empire, and all Russian ports, except those situated on the shores of the Arctic Ocean and the White Sea, and all ports of Great Britain and Ireland, of

(*a.*) Horned cattle, sheep, goats, and other ruminants, and swine.

(*b.*) Raw produce of such animals, specially skins and hides (also when dried or salted), hair, bristles, wool, horns, hoofs, and bones, in an unmanufactured state, and fat when not melted.

(*c.*) Fodder, specially of grass, clover, hay, and straw.

(*d.*) Implements employed in tending live stock, if previously made use of.

The prohibition, however, not to extend to the importation of hides, horns, and wool, provided it be shown that such articles of produce merely passed in transit through one of the ports comprised in this prohibition.

2. From French Atlantic and Channel ports, of animals and produce specified under *a*, *b*, and *d*; and,

3. From Holland and Belgium, of horned cattle, sheep, and goats.

And it is furthermore prohibited, in pursuance of the said Section 8, by a Royal Mandate of the 14th of March 1870, to import horses from any of the Russian Baltic ports (including the ports of the Gulfs of Bothnia and Finland); and finally a Royal Mandate, bearing date the 18th May 1876, prohibits the importation of dogs from Denmark.

With regard to scab amongst sheep and goats, a disease which has been found to prevail in the south-western provinces of the kingdom, special provisions are contained in an Act of the 15th September 1851 (Appendix VI.). This Act empowers the Council of the Amt to issue, if needful, special protective orders, subject to the Royal sanction, and such orders have accordingly been issued for the Amts of Nedemes, Lister, and Mandal, Stavanger, Londre, Bergenhus, Romsdal, Buskerud, and Christian. A printed copy of the regulations laid down for one Amt is annexed (Appendix VII.). By a rigid enforcement of the provisions of the Acts and of the special protective measures adopted in conformity therewith, the disease has been, to a great extent, suppressed of late years.

Appendix, No. 10.

Appendix I.

From the Central Statistical Bureau.

Christiania, 18 June 1877.

In accordance with instructions received, the Central Statistical Bureau has the honour to submit a statement of the number of domestic animals in Norway at the close of 1875, and of the importation and exportation of live-stock during the quinquennial term extending from 1871 to 1875:—

I.—Number of Domestic Animals in *Norway* at the expiration of 1875.

Horses	151,903*	Goats	323,364
Cattle	1,016,595†	Swine	101,351
Sheep	1,686,806		

II.—Importation of Live Stock.

Name of Country.	1871.	1872.	1873.	1874.	1875.
(*a.*)—Horses:					
Sweden, by rail	—	20	155	423	134
„ overland	2	—	28	20	—
„ by sea	—	—	91	16	5
Denmark	17	29	60	138	76
Iceland	—	63	14	—	5
Great Britain and Ireland	—	4	8	—	—
Northern Russia	—	—	—	31	2
Baltic Ports of German Empire	—	—	2	—	1
Hamburg	—	—	6	3	1
France	—	—	—	4	15
Total	19	116	364	635	239
(*b.*)—Horned Cattle:					
Sweden, by rail	—	591	536	1,315	1,012
„ overland	1,650	761	841	990	1,032
„ by sea	47	25	23	17	59
Denmark	224	353	536	825	1,150
Northern Russia	5	—	5	10	5
Great Britain and Ireland	—	—	—	2	—
Hamburg	—	—	—	59	—
France	—	—	—	—	2
Total	1,926	1,730	1,941	3,218	3,260
(*c.*)—Swine:					
Sweden, by rail	—	21	22	185	97
„ overland	1,446	2,555	1,456	1,678	773
„ by sea	2,122	1,950	2,635	2,768	2,571
Denmark	7,451	4,015	3,878	5,069	3,105
Great Britain and Ireland	48	40	85	22	20
Northern Russia	5	—	2	2	2
Russian Baltic Ports	2	—	—	—	—
Baltic Ports of German Empire	—	3	—	2	—
Hamburg	1	—	—	—	500
Bremen	—	1	—	1	—
North Sea Ports of German Empire	3	—	—	10	—
Holland	20	35	9	6	26
Belgium	10	1	3	1	2
France	2	2	2	5	1
United States	1	1	1	—	—
Total	11,111	8,624	8,093	9,749	7,097

* Three-year-old and above, 119,932; under three years, 31,971.

† Bulls and oxen, two years and above, 25,056; cows, 741,594; heifers and calves, 249,945.

II.—Importation of Live Stock—*continued.*

Name of Country.	1871.	1872.	1873.	1874.	1875.
(*d.*)—Sheep:					
Sweden, by rail	-	4	9	13	59
„ overland	651	777	969	1,791	656
„ by sea	120	116	148	294	342
Denmark	146	83	276	850	753
Iceland	-	-	-	30	2
Great Britain and Ireland	-	-	1	—	—
Northern Russia	-	-	8	4	5
Hamburg	-	9	—	—	—
Holland	-	1	—	—	—
Portugal	-	3	—	—	—
Total	917	993	1,411	2,982	1,817

III.—Exportation of Live Stock.

Name of Country.	1871.	1872.	1873.	1874.	1875.
(*a.*)—Horses:					
Sweden, by sea	-	1	—	—	—
Denmark	217	181	8	21	16
Great Britain and Ireland	187	539	40	14	22
Baltic Ports of German Empire	-	-	-	2	—
Hamburg	2	-	2	—	—
Bremen	-	2	—	—	—
North Sea Ports of German Empire	-	4	—	—	—
Holland	-	6	—	—	—
France	-	-	-	1	2
Total	406	733	50	38	40
(*b.*)—Horned Cattle:					
Sweden, by sea	-	-	-	-	2
Denmark	19	50	-	-	2
Great Britain and Ireland	1,075	1,367	1,994	1,130	259
France	-	-	102	—	—
Total	1,094	1,417	2,096	1,130	263
(*c.*)—Swine:					
Great Britain and Ireland	34	20	—	—	—
(*d.*)—Sheep:					
Great Britain and Ireland	3,128	4,768	2,769	154	6
Hamburg	-	310	—	—	—
Denmark	-	-	-	-	3
Total	3,128	5,078	2,769	154	9

There being no special returns for goats, the Central Statistical Bureau is unable to give the importation and exportation of these animals; it is believed, however, to have been exceedingly limited.

The returns for 1876 have not yet been sent in.

Appendix, No. 10.

Appendix II.

ACT (27 February 1866 and 26 May 1877) for the Suppression of Virulent Contagious Diseases amongst Domestic Animals.

Sect. 1. All duly-qualified veterinary surgeons availing themselves of their right of practice shall forthwith report to the authorities any case of virulent contagious disease amongst domestic animals they may have treated or detected, stating what measures have been taken to counteract the disease and prevent its propagation. And at the close of every year they shall forward, through the Amtmand of their province, to the department of Government dealing with matters of civil medicine, a report, such as that department shall see fit to prescribe, of all cases of disease amongst domestic animals they may have observed or treated during the past year.

Sect. 2. The diseases to which the attention of the authorities is specially directed are: anthrax and syphus, attacking domestic animals generally; the cattle plague (as it is called), and virulent lung-disease amongst horned cattle; glanders and farcy, amongst horses; sheep-pox and virulent foot-and-mouth disease, amongst sheep; and hydrophobia.
Should any other contagious disease assume an exceptionally virulent character, His Majesty the King is empowered to extend the provisions of this Act to such disease also.

Sect. 3. The Amtmand may, at his discretion, engage a veterinary surgeon to attend all horse and cattle fairs or shows, and to repair to any place within the Amt where domestic animals are congregated, with the object of investigating whether any of the animals are suffering from virulent contagious disease; and it is strictly forbidden to drive or convey animals known to be infected with such disease to those localities, or to markets in the towns, or to seek to dispose of them there.
And the Amtmand is furthermore empowered to have all animals of a kind that may at any time be specially threatened with contagious disease examined by a veterinary surgeon; all examinations to be conducted in a manner not calculated to propagate the disease.

Sect. 4. In the event of an animal being attacked with any of the diseases enumerated in Section 2, or should there be suspicion of such being the case, the owner shall call in a qualified veterinary surgeon, or make report, in the towns, to the prefect of police, and in the country, to the Lensmand (parish bailiff).
If, on examination, the animal prove to be suffering from the disease, or should there be strong suspicion of such being the case, the infected animal shall be immediately isolated, and everything with which it has been in contact, so far as practicable, thoroughly disinfected.
If the animal attacked has been brought from some other locality, the prefect of police or the Lensmand there shall receive information of the outbreak.
His Majesty the King, or whomsoever he shall see fit to appoint, is empowered to issue such special orders as may be found necessary for the enforcement of the regulations providing for the perfect isolation of infected animals and for disinfection.

Sect. 5. When there is strong suspicion of the disease being the cattle plague, or pleuropneumonia, the Amtmand may order the compulsory slaughter of *one* or *two* animals, in order to ascertain with greater certainty, from a post-mortem examination by the veterinary surgeon, the nature of the disease.
All animals shall, at the command of the Amtmand, on the veterinary surgeon having pronounced them infected with either of the two diseases specified above, be immediately slaughtered, until such time as the department of Government mentioned in Section 1 may see fit to prohibit compulsory slaughter. And that department is moreover empowered, on an outbreak of the disease, to order the slaughter of the whole stock among which the disease has appeared. Horses pronounced by the veterinary surgeon to be suffering from incurable glanders or farcy shall be slaughtered.
Animals compulsorily slaughtered shall, in the event of the owner claiming compensation, be valued, previous to slaughter, by a police officer (in the country by the Lensmand), and two men nominated by him. The estimatad value of such animals to be what they might be assumed to be worth in a healthy state. From this sum shall be deduced the value of the carcase, if it may be utilised.
Of every animal slaughtered a post-mortem examination shall be made by a veterinary surgeon, who, through the Amtmand of his province, shall send in to the Department of Government before mentioned a carefully-drawn-up report of the nature and character of the disease, together with the details of the post-mortem examination.

Sect. 6. The owner is entitled, within the limits given below, to claim compensation for animals compulsorily slaughtered in pursuance of Section 5.
For animals which, after a post-mortem examination, show no traces of the diseases specified in Section 5, the indemnity to be the full amount at which they are valued in the manner prescribed above.
For animals which, after a post-mortem examination, are found to have been suffering from

from the cattle plague, or pleuro-pneumonia, the indemnity to be two-thirds of the amount at which they are valued in the manner prescribed above.

When the owner, by the importation of infected animals from foreign countries, or by violating the orders issued for the suppression of the disease, may be regarded as having himself occasioned the loss, no indemnity will be paid for animals compulsorily slaughtered.

For horses which, after a post-mortem examination, are found to have been attacked with glanders or farcy, no compensation can be claimed.

Sect. 7. All animals attacked with hydrophobia are to be killed.

Dogs or cats bitten by an animal suffering from hydrophobia shall also be destroyed; and every other animal shall in like case, pursuant to the provisions of Section 4 for animals suspected of being attacked with contagious disease, be kept confined in complete isolation.

For towns or country localities in or near which hydrophobia has broken out, the Amtmand may, by public notification, issue orders requiring all dogs within a certain specified district to be kept tied up and confined, or to be provided with a muzzle of a description specified in the notification. Should the disease assume an alarming character, the Amtmand shall, moreover, in such notification additionally enjoin that no dog, though duly provided with the muzzle prescribed, be permitted to go at large unless led by a grown-up person.

Dogs found in the public streets after the issue of such orders will be seized by the police, and, in conformity with the notification, either killed at once or after three days, unless the owner within that time appear to claim them and pay the expenses of their keeping.

All expenses attending the seizure, keeping, and killing of dogs to be defrayed by the amt, market-town, or ladested (small town where ships may take in, but not discharge their cargoes), (sholstan, nedennude son anmehung), provided such ladested have a municipal council.

For animals killed in pursuance of the provisions of this section no compensation will be given.

Sect. 8. His Majesty the King is empowered to prohibit the importation from countries where virulent contagious disease prevails of horned cattle, horses, and other domestic animals, of raw produce furnished from such animals (specially hides, wool, horns, hair, hoofs, fat when not melted, and meat), and of implements assumed to be infectable.

Should absolute prohibition of importation be deemed unnecessary, His Majesty the King will decide what preventive measures shall be taken to guard against the introduction of the contagion through the medium of infected animals and infectable things.

Sect. 9. All expenses entailed, pursuant to the provisions of this Act, in the tending, isolation, and disinfection of animals attacked or suspected of being attacked with contagious disease, in the disinfection of stalls, stables, cow-houses, implements, and the like, or in burying the carcases of slaughtered animals, &c., shall be borne by the owner.

Expenses occasioned by the valuations enjoined in Section 5, and the compensation due to owners of slaughtered animals in pursuance of Section 6, shall be defrayed, for such animals as, on examination, were found not to have been suffering from the diseases specified in that section, by the State; but for animals that were found to have been infected with the cattle plague or virulent lung-disease, half by the State, and half by the amt, market-town, or ladested, provided such ladested have a municipal council.

Sect. 10. On all persons violating the provisions of this Act, or the orders issued in pursuance thereof, fines will be imposed, and they will be cited to appear before the police court.

Sect. 11. The sale of an animal suffering from virulent contagious disease is not valid, though the person even from whom it has been purchased was ignorant of the fact.

Sect. 12. Veterinary surgeons acting for the public shall receive a daily stipend of four kroner, so long as their services are given; all journeys to be paid for at the rate fixed by the Act for the conveyance of travellers; for every post-mortem examination of a horse or head of cattle, they shall receive in addition a fee of 6 kroner; for post-mortem examinations of smaller animals, 3 kroner for every examination; the amount paid to a veterinary surgeon for post-mortem examinations performed in one day in no case, however, to exceed 20 kroner.

Travelling expenses are defrayed by the State; the payment of all other sums due to veterinary surgeons devolving upon the amt, market-town, or ladested, provided such ladested have a municipal council.

Sect. 13. Journeys undertaken by the Lensmaud to conduct the valuations enjoined in Section 5 shall be paid for at the rate fixed by the Act for the regulation of fees, Section 110.

The expenses of other journeys he may have to undertake in carrying out the provisions of this Act to be defrayed by the State, provided the distance to and from the place visited exceed half a Norwegian mile.

In the event of his assistance having been widely given in extirpating the diseases specified in this Act, His Majesty the King may grant him a commensurate remuneration out of the national exchequer.

Appendix, No. 10.

Sect. 14. The Decree of 28th November 1806, containing regulations respecting horses attacked with contagious disease, and the Act of the 15th April 1854, prohibiting the importation of horned cattle, horses, and other domestic animals from countries where contagious disease amongst animals may prevail, are hereby rescinded.

Appendix III.

Pursuant to Section 4 of the Act of the 27th February 1866, for the suppression of virulent contagious diseases amongst domestic animals, and a Royal Decree of the 7th March 1868, investing the Home Department with powers provided for in that Act, the following Regulations shall be observed respecting glanders or farcy amongst horses:

Sect. 1. So soon as a horse is found to be suffering from glanders or farcy (horse-pox), all horses that have been stabled with the infected animal, or that have been in contact with it, shall be subject to the inspection of the authorities, such inspection to continue for the space of six calendar months from the day when intercourse ceased with the horse attacked or suspected of being attacked with glanders or farcy.

Sect. 2. Every horse attacked or suspected of being attacked with glanders or farcy to be immediately isolated from the healthy animals.

Sect. 3. If the disease from which the horse is suffering be unquestionably glanders or farcy, the animal shall be forthwith killed, and a post-mortem examination made of the carcase, provided the services of a veterinary surgeon can be engaged for the purpose. Post-mortem examinations should be undertaken, too, of all horses subjected to the inspection of the authorities that may die of glanders or farcy.

Sect. 4. The hide of the infected animal may be utilised, provided it be laid in a lime-pit, or dried in some safe place, or straightway conveyed to a tannery in a manner not calculated to spread the contagion.

The flesh, when not in a mortified state, may be given to animals as food.

All parts of the carcase attacked by the disease to be buried.

Sect. 5. Every horse suspected of being attacked with glanders or farcy shall, in the event of the owner preferring not to have it killed, be kept in complete isolation from all other animals, and from strangers, until the veterinary surgeon has verified the disease.

The horse to be tended during such period by persons not coming in contact with the healthy horses, and who are provided with separate stable implements.

Sect. 6. All stables in which horses attacked or suspected of being attacked with glanders or farcy have been lodged are to be disinfected, first by being thoroughly swept and scrubbed with cold water, after which all wood and iron work has to be washed with boiling water (of a temperature not lower than + 60° R.), and, when dry, treated with a solution of 1 part of undiluted carbolic acid to 100 parts of water, or of 1 part of chloride of lime to 12 parts of water, or with some other disinfecting fluid pronounced by the veterinary surgeon to be equally efficacious. The masonry of the stable to be whitewashed after disinfection. The stable itself to be well ventilated for the space of three days, and not to be used till thoroughly dry.

Other articles, such as harness, and all stable implements that may have been in contact with the infected horse, to be disinfected, according to the nature of such articles, either by being washed with boiling water or soap-and-water, or by being treated with the prescribed solution of carbolic acid or chloride of lime, or some equally effective disinfectant, or to be subjected to the influence of heat (for instance, in a moderately heated baker's oven), the temperature not being lower than + 60° R.

Sect. 7. Horses apparently healthy, but which, in pursuance of Section 1 of these Regulations, have been subjected to the supervision of the authorities, must not, when worked, be brought in contact with other horses; for instance at posting-stations and resting-places generally, nor must they be stabled in strange localities, or permitted to graze on unenclosed land; such horses, too, must not be sold, unless the fact of their being under the supervision of the authorities be disclosed to the purchaser, and the veterinary surgeon of the district and prefect of police receive notice of the sale. These functionaries shall then report such sale to the police (or lensmand) of the town or locality where the new owner of the horse is domiciled.

Sect. 8. At the close of the term to which a horse under suspicion of being attacked with glanders or farcy has been subjected to the supervision of the authorities, the veterinary surgeon of the district shall give to the owner of the animal a certificate containing the name and address of the owner, an accurate description of the horse, as to sex, colour, conspicuous marks, age, height, condition, &c., together with a specification of the disease from which the horse was suspected to have been suffering, and a statement to the effect that the animal is not infected or suspected of being infected with such disease, so that danger is no longer to be apprehended. The veterinary surgeon to report the issue of the certificate to the police (or lendsmand).

Appendix IV.

Home Department, Christiania, 13 May 1868.

Pursuant to Section 4 of the Act of the 27th February 1866, for the suppression of virulent contagious diseases amongst domestic animals, and a Royal Decree of the 7th March 1868, investing the Home Department with powers provided for in that Act, the following Regulations shall be observed respecting *anthrax* (malignant pustule) amongst domestic animals :—

Sect. 1. So soon as any domestic animal is found to be attacked with anthrax, such animal to be removed from the healthy animals, if possible, immediately, and isolated from all other domestic animals, and from strangers.

When practicable, it is better to lodge the healthy animals in some other byre or stable, the infected animal being kept in the building where it sickened with the disease.

Small animals, such as swine, dogs, cats, poultry, and the like, must not only be prevented from coming in contact with the infected animals, but also with its excrements, with dead but unburied animals, or with articles contaminated with the blood, mucus, &c. of infected beasts.

Animals stalled or stabled with the infected animal should not be allowed for several days to graze in company with healthy animals.

All persons tending infected animals should not come in contact with other animals.

Sect. 2. Animals that have died from anthrax to be buried with the hides at a safe distance from dwelling-houses, roads, and pasture-grounds, in pits of a depth sufficient to admit of the carcases being at least two ells beneath the surface of the soil. Where lime can be procured it should be strewn into the pit.

The excrements, offal, and other refuse of the infected animals to be removed as soon as possible and buried.

Sect. 3. Stables, cow-houses, or other buildings in which infected animals have been lodged, and all articles with which they have been in contact, shall as soon as possible be thoroughly disinfected, and not used for other animals till after the lapse of several weeks.

Stables, cow-houses, and other buildings to be ventilated, thoroughly cleansed with hot water or lye, and the spot where the animal stood to be disinfected by being fumigated with chlorine-gas, or treated with a solution of carbolic acid (one part of carbolic acid to 100 parts of water), or with a solution of chloride of lime (one part of chloride of lime to 12 parts of water), or by being strewn with pulverised chloride of lime. All masonry to be white-limed. If enjoined by the veterinary surgeon, or by the authorities, the flooring where the animal stood shall be taken up and thoroughly disinfected in the manner prescribed above, previous to being replaced, or, when old and of trifling value, burnt, and new flooring laid down; earthen, gravel, or loam floors are to be dug up and removed, and new material filled in. All racks, mangers, vessels, and other utensils are to be washed with soap-and-water, and disinfected in the manner prescribed. Ironwork, such as cows' collars, should be heated to a red-heat.

Malignant pustule attacking men no less than animals, and with equally destructive effects, the following precautionary measures are appended, for the inhabitants of localities in which the disease may break out:—

Persons engaged in tending infected animals, burying the carcases, or disinfecting contaminated articles, should be duly warned and enjoined to take the greatest care when so occupied; they should avoid, if possible, all contact with blood, mucus, and other infectable matter, which is especially dangerous when introduced into sores and excoriations. Infectable matter should be immediately washed off the skin with *cold* water and soap, or, better still, with a solution of aqua-fortis or sulphuric acid (one part of the acid to 12 parts of water), or with vinegar. Should a human subject be attacked with the disease, no time ought to be lost in sending for medical assistance.

Appendix V.

From the Director of the Department of Civil Medicine.

Home Department, Christiania, 26 August 1870.

Pursuant to Section 4 of the Act of the 27th February 1866, for the suppression of virulent contagious diseases amongst domestic animals, and a Royal Decree of the 31st July 1875, investing the Director of Civil Medicine with powers provided for in that Act, the following Regulations shall be observed respecting foot-and-mouth disease amongst sheep:—

Sect. 1. So soon as a sheep is found to be attacked with foot-and-mouth disease, every animal in the flock shall be subjected to the inspection of the authorities, such inspection to continue till the veterinary surgeon appointed for the district shall declare the disease to have been eradicated, and the fold, or cot, has been thoroughly ventilated in the manner prescribed below.

Appendix, No. 10.

Sect. 2. Every animal to be carefully examined, and all showing symptoms of the disease to be removed to a building set apart for sick animals. The animals thus isolated shall not be allowed to graze in company with the healthy ones, or to make use of the same tracks.

Sect. 3. The examination to be repeated at least once a week, and sheep suspected of being attacked to be forthwith removed to the building set apart for sick animals.

Sect. 4. Animals apparently cured shall, previous to being taken back to the cot in general use, be lodged in some other building, where they shall continue under supervision for at least three weeks.

Sect 5. If the infected animals are slaughtered, the heads and feet shall be buried.

Sect. 6. To prevent the propagation of the disease amongst the animals not yet attacked, there shall be placed at the door of the cot a trough of sufficient dimensions, containing a solution of chloride of lime (1 lb. of chloride of lime to a bucket of water), four or five inches deep, which the sheep must pass by on entering and leaving the building.

Sect. 7. All persons engaged in tending sick animals not to come in contact with the healthy sheep until they have washed, and put on other or thoroughly disinfected clothing.

Sect. 8. On the suppression of the disease, the sheep-cot shall be disinfected in the following manner: The top layer of earthen floor to be dug up, and fresh earth filled in. All woodwork to be treated with hot lye, or a solution of chloride of lime; masonry to be whitewashed. Ventilation to continue for at least one week.

Sect. 9. All pasture-grounds on which the infected animals have grazed, and the tracks they have traversed, should not be used for some time to come.

Sect. 10. The sale of animals from a flock infected with foot-and-mouth disease is forbidden till after a period of three months from the time when the animal last attacked was pronounced to be cured.

ACT of the 15th of September 1851, for the Suppression of Scab amongst Sheep and Goats.

Christiania, 11 January 1876.

Sect. 1. In every Amt where scab may break out amongst sheep and goats, or where, on account of its proximity to the district or districts in which the disease prevails, there is good reason to apprehend an outbreak, the Council of the Amt is hereby empowered to issue orders for the suppression of the disease, together with regulations respecting the isolation, and, if necessary, compulsory slaughter of infected animals; the validity of such orders, however, to be dependent on the sanction of His Majesty the King.

Sect. 2. The violation of orders issued in pursuance of Section 1 of this Act shall entail a penalty of from one to ten specie dollars,* such penalty to be paid to the fund for the relief of the poor.

Sect. 3. All cases connected with the violation of orders, as specified in Section 2, to be adjudged by the Police Court, unless the party concerned agree to pay the fine imposed by the authorities. In such case, all particulars shall be entered in the Register of the Police Court, and fines, if necessary, recovered by distraint.

ORDERS issued for the Suppression of Scab amongst Sheep and Goats in Lister and Mandals Amt.

In every locality having a district council where scab is found to prevail amongst sheep, or in any locality where the disease may hereafter break out, or where, from its close proximity to the infected districts, there is reason to apprehend its existence, the district council shall elect from among the inhabitants of such locality, provided they possess the qualities requisite for filling parochial offices, a committee, on which shall devolve the duty of strictly enforcing the regulations laid down for the extirpation of the contagion: the number of members of which such committee shall consist to be fixed by the district council, commensurate with the local resources, and the extent to which the disease has spread—in no case, however, of less than three.

The members are not compelled to act for a longer period than two years, and every year half of their number shall retire.

The district council is empowered, where the local requirements call for such augmentation, to appoint several committees, a separate locality being assigned to each, the members of which shall be chosen from among the inhabitants of such locality.

Sect. 2.

---

* One specie dollar is equal to 4 kroner.

Sect. 2. The members of committees to be appointed in pursuance of the foregoing sections are entitled to a fee of one mark* per diem for the period their services are given.

Every committee to elect a president, and to make all necessary arrangements for the effective discharge of the duties devolving upon it, and the distribution of those duties amongst the members.

Sect. 3. So soon as scab, or evident symptoms of the disease, shall appear amongst sheep in any locality for which no committee of supervision has been appointed, all persons owning or having in their charge sheep attacked with the disease shall forthwith report the outbreak to the district council. In localities for which a committee of supervision has been appointed, report to be forthwith made to that committee.

Sect. 4. The committee of supervision shall, so soon as there is good reason to believe that the disease reported is actually scab, instruct the owner of the infected animals, or the person having them in his charge, within such time as the committee, according to the season of the year and other considerations, shall see fit to determine, either to slaughter the animals, or to isolate them, and to subject them to curative treatment. In the latter case, the person having the sheep in his charge must effect their isolation in such manner as the committee shall pronounce calculated not to spread the disease amongst the healthy animals, and proceed with their cure in the manner that has already been or may afterwards be prescribed by the authorities. And should the person having the sheep in his charge fail to effect their cure within the period determined by the committee of supervision, or whomsoever may be appointed by the authorities to cure the disease (the decision of the committee or such officially appointed person being final), he shall slaughter the infected animals, or must submit to their compulsory slaughter by order of the authorities (the committee of supervision, the person appointed for the cure of the disease, or the police).

Sect. 5. When sheep infected with scab are slaughtered, the skins shall be hung up in the open air till they are perfectly dry, and for not less than three weeks together; the wool, too, must be dipped in boiling water before being utilised.

Sect. 6. Should the committees of supervision, in carrying out the provisions of Section 4, or otherwise in the discharge of their duties, deem public notifications needful, such notifications to be issued in conformity with the custom of the locality.

Sect. 7. The committees of supervision shall be at liberty, in the event of a veterinary surgeon being appointed for the Amt, to avail themselves of his services as frequently as they may deem necessary, to verify the nature of a disease, supposed to be scab, that has broken out amongst sheep, or in other matters calling for the assistance of a competent veterinary surgeon.

Sect. 8. Should the Council of the Amt see fit to transfer the whole or some part of the duties devolving on the committees of supervision to veterinary surgeons, if necessary with appointed assistants, the report of an outbreak of scab disease, provided for in Section 3, shall be made to the Lensmand of the district; the Lensmand has forthwith to make it known to the veterinary surgeon, who shall as soon as possible examine the animals attacked, and take the necessary steps for the enforcement of the regulations laid down in Section 4.

The veterinary surgeon to be remunerated for services rendered in pursuance of the foregoing or present section from the treasury of the Amt, the Council of the Amt fixing the amount.

For journeys undertaken for the extirpation of the disease, he shall receive payment from the State for one horse; water-posting at the same rate.

The assistants mentioned in this section to receive such remuneration and compensation for expenses incurred as the Council of the Amt shall determine.

Sect. 9. The cost of medicine and drugs for the treatment of sheep infected with scab to be defrayed by the Amt; all other expenses attending their cure to be paid by the owner, or the person having them in his charge.

Sect. 10. Should a sheep infected with scab, whose owner is unknown or cannot be discovered in the neighbourhood, be found straying on another person's property, the committee of supervision may order it to be slaughtered, and the owner or person who had charge of it shall have no claim for compensation.

Sect. 11. All questions of indemnity for damage occasioned by the violation of this Act to be settled in conformity with the provisions regulating compensation in general.

Sect. 12. The orders now issued are valid only for Lister and Mandals Amt; but the inhabitants of other Amts are forbidden, in pursuance of the Act of the 15th September 1851, Section 2, to introduce sheep suffering from the scab into Lister and Mandals Amt, or to drive sheep suffering from scab to any grazing-ground, sheep-walk, or *chalét* situated within the boundaries of the Amt, or to any other locality where the inhabitants of this Amt are wont to pasture sheep.

* One mark is equal to 80 ore, or four-fifths of a krone.

Appendix, No. 11.

Appendix, No. 11. MEMORIAL put in, with the consent of the Committee, by the Borough of *Newcastle.*

To the Cattle Plague Committee of the House of Commons.

The humble MEMORIAL of the Cattle Trade Committee of the Borough of *Newcastle-upon-Tyne,*

Sheweth,

THAT the Cattle Market of Newcastle-upon-Tyne is held weekly, and is the market from which the requirements of the borough, having a population of 128,443 inhabitants, and of the borough of Gateshead, separated only from Newcastle by the breadth of the River Tyne, and having a population of 48,627; also the neighbouring boroughs of Sunderland, North and South Shields, with a total aggregate population of 359,589, together with all the numerous and densely populated villages surrounding and in the neighbourhood of these different boroughs, forming a population enormous in extent, are supplied.

That provision has been made in the Newcastle Cattle Market for the supply of this vast population, the number of animals brought into it being as follows:—

In the year 1876:

	Cattle.	Sheep.	Swine.
British - - -	62,994	296,307	33,020
Foreign - - -	41,882	46,021	3,080
TOTAL - - -	104,876	342,328	36,100

The trade is increasing with great rapidity, the number of foreign cattle imported this week being 1,000.

That without this importation of foreign cattle it would have been impracticable fully to provide food for the population of this extensive district, and that the supply has been attended not only with the greatest possible advantage to the inhabitants, but without materially or injuriously affecting the price of English cattle.

That your Memorialists, sensible of the reponsibility attaching to them in the providing suitable accommodation for a traffic so vast, have provided an extensive market for the sale of cattle at a cost of upwards of 25,000 *l.*; and having also regard to the necessity of the due examination and inspection of the foreign cattle, have erected suitable lairs for their isolation and inspection, at a cost of upwards of 22,000 *l.*, and which they are now increasing, at an estimated cost of 9,000 *l.*

That a regular line of steam-vessels has been established between this port and the continent for the conveyance of foreign cattle, and that the vessels engaged in this trade have been expressly built for its use, and are properly fitted up for the stowage of cattle and to protect them during the sea voyage, and that a very large capital has been invested in this trade.

That foreign cattle, on being landed, are taken direct under superintendence and to the avoidance of public roads to the lairs or sanatorium, and they there remain for twelve hours, and are not allowed to pass over the streets of the town or to the market until each animal has been carefully examined by the Government inspector, and that if any symptoms or suspicion of disease appear, the animals are either all slaughtered at the lairs or only released on their healthy condition having been ascertained.

That this system has worked well, and that your Memorialists are convinced it has been effectual, and that the introduction of disease amongst English cattle is not attributable to, and cannot be traced to, the importation into this port of foreign cattle.

The manure in the vessels accumulated during the voyage is mixed with quicklime, as is the manure bred at the lairs.

That your Memorialists earnestly deprecate any interference with a trade which has produced

duced such satisfactory and beneficial results, and the introduction of a system which might altogether fail to provide an adequate supply of food to meet the demands of a rapidly-increasing population, which might not ensure at all seasons a sufficient and regular supply, and to which foreign countries and agriculturists might or might not at their pleasure conform, but dedicate their pasturage to other objects and other countries, and which would neither furnish a supply of fresh meat nor afford perfect protection against the evils sought to be guarded against, inasmuch as the hides of animals slaughtered abroad would be brought into this country in enormous quantities, and so disease might notwithstanding be imported.

There are about 1,120 cows kept within the borough, a number which does not fully satisfy the requirements of the inhabitants, the deficiency being supplied from the country.

There is within the borough an open common of 1,300 acres, on which cows alone are depastured, and beyond this there also exists pasturage in other parts of it to a large extent.

These animals are not kept in heated byres, and do not spread disease, the livelihood of the keepers of these cows depending upon their healthy condition, which of itself necessarily leads to care and attention.

Your Memorialists, however, have not solely depended upon this.

There are herdsmen whose sole duty it is to inspect cows, who in their turn are superintended by a select body representing the parties entitled to the herbage.

Your Memorialists have also appointed an inspector of cows and byres, with assistants, who inspect the animals, more particularly in the summer, two or three times every week, and if any diseased or suspected animal is discovered it is immediately removed and isolated.

All the byres in the borough are carefully examined by the inspectors and the corporation medical officer of health. The measurement, ventilation, and drainage, and other particulars of every byre are ascertained, except of byres belonging to private gentlemen.

In the event of disease the animals are at once slaughtered, and the byre is disinfected with carbolic acid or chloride of lime, and lime-washed. If the animal be one of a number, the rest are confined in the byre for 30 days.

Your Memorialists, although deeply sensible of the importance of the question involved, and entertaining strong views of the inexpediency of the changes which have been suggested, have not felt themselves at liberty to discuss those changes in detail, but have confined themselves to a statement of facts relating to their district.

And your Memorialists will ever pray, &c.

Dated this 10th day of July 1877.

(signed) *Thos. Wilson*,
Chairman of the Cattle Trade Committee of
the Borough of Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Appendix, No. 12.

PAPER handed in by Professor *Brown*, 19 July 1877.

Appendix, No. 12.

ORDERS OF COUNCIL.

At the Council Chamber, Whitehall, the 18th day of July 1877.

By the Lords of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council.

PRESENT:

Lord Chancellor. | Lord President.

THE Lords and others of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, by virtue and in exercise of the powers in them vested under the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869, and of every other power enabling them in this behalf, do order, and it is hereby ordered, as follows:

1. Words in this Order have the same meaning as in The Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869.

2. For the purposes of this Order that part of the Metropolis which is situate within the following boundaries shall be deemed to be the infected area:—

The River Thames on the south, the Regent's Canal on the east and north, and the westerly sides of Kingsland-road, Shoreditch High-street, Norton Folgate, Bishopsgate-street Without, Bishopsgate-street Within, Gracechurch-street, and King William-street.

3. No cow or heifer shall be moved alive out of the infected area.

4. No animal shall be moved alive out of a cowhouse or shed in the infected area.

5. The movement of cows and heifers within the infected area is hereby prohibited, except as follows:—

Any cow or heifer (not being in a cowhouse or shed in the infected area) may be moved for immediate slaughter to a slaughter-house in the infected area, with a license of an inspector of the local authority authorised to issue the same; and such license shall be available for 12 hours and no longer; and the license shall specify the slaughter-house to which the cow or heifer may be taken for slaughter, and it shall not be taken elsewhere.

6. If any animal is moved in contravention of the provisions of this Order, the owner thereof, and the person directing or permitting their removal, and the company or person removing or conveying them, shall each be deemed guilty of an offence against this Order.

C. L. Peel.

At the Council Chamber, Whitehall, the 18th day of July 1877.

By the Lords of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council.

PRESENT:

Lord Chancellor. | Lord President.

THE Lords and others of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, by virtue and in exercise of the powers in them vested under The Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869, and of every other power enabling them in this behalf, do order, and it is hereby ordered, as follows:—

1. Words in this Order have the same meaning as in the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869.

2. No cattle shall be moved from any place within that part of the Metropolis which is situate north of the River Thames to any place with that part of the Metropolis which is situate south of the River Thames.

3. If any cattle are moved in contravention of the provisions of this Order, the owner thereof, and the person directing or permitting their removal, and the Company or person removing or conveying them, shall each be deemed guilty of an offence against this Order.

C. L. Peel.

INDEX.

ANALYSIS OF INDEX.

LIST of the PRINCIPAL HEADINGS in the following INDEX, with the Pages at which they may be found.

PAGE

AMERICAN CATTLE (IMPORT OF LIVE STOCK):
1. *Superior Breed and Quality of American Cattle; Way in which fed and fattened* - 609
2. *Condition on Arrival in England; Loss or Depreciation during the Voyage* - - 610
3. *Extent and Prospects of the Trade* - - 610
4. *Question of Restrictions on the Score of Disease* - - - - - - - - 610

AMERICAN DEAD MEAT:
I. *Supply:*
1. Amount of Import hitherto of American Beef - - - 611
2. Prospects of increased Import; conflicting Views on this Point - 611
3. Very large available Supply in the States - - - - - - 612
II. *Practice as to slaughter before Shipment* 612
III. *Arrangements before Shipment and on board Ship; Process of Refrigeration, and Effects thereof* - - - - 612
IV. *Freight; relative Cost in the case of Dead Meat and Live Cattle* - - - 613
V. *Quality and Condition of American Beef:*
1. Adverse Evidence as to the Condition of the Meat on Arrival in this Country, especially in Hot Weather - - - - - - 613
2. Favourable Testimony as to the Quality and Condition of the Meat, save under exceptional Circumstances - - - 614
3. Curing Properties of American Meat - - - - - - 616
4. Quantity condemned as spoiled - 616
VI. *Storage and Transit in this Country* - 616
VII. *Price:*
1. In America - - - - - 616
2. In England - - - - - 616
VIII. *Extent and Character of the Demand in London and in the Provinces* - - 617
IX. *Practice of Butchers as to the Sale of American Meat* - - - - - 618
X. *Pork and Mutton* - - - - 618
XI. *Conclusions of the Committee* - - 618

Australia - - - - - - - - - - 618
Belgium - - - - - - - - - - 620
Bristol - - - - - - - - - - 621
Carcases (Diseased Animals) - - - - - 632

PAGE

CATTLE PLAGUE:
1. *Introduction of Cattle Plague in to England from Abroad; Immunity otherwise* - 632
2. *Particulars in connection with recent Outbreaks in January and July* 1877 - 633
3. *Outbreaks in* 1865 *and* 1872 - - - 633
4. *Outbreak in Ireland in* 1866 - - - 634
5. *Measures adopted by the Privy Council, and Effect thereof; Several Orders of Council on the Subject* - - - 634
6. *Arrangements for obtaining Information from Abroad; amended Regulations required* - - - - - - - 634
7. *Difficulty in obtaining prompt Information from Owners in this Country* - - 635
8. *Infectious Nature of the Disease* - - 635
9. *Period of Incubation* - - - - 635
10. *Losses from Cattle Plague* - - - 635
11. *Suggestions on the Subject of Prohibition of Import* - - - - - - 635
12. *Full Powers and prompt Action necessary as regards the Slaughter of Diseased Animals* - - - - - - - 636
13. *Action taken by Local Authorities* - - 637
14 *Conclusions of the Committee* - - - 637

Cattle Salesmen - - - - - - - - 637
CATTLE SHIPS - - - - - - - - 637
COMPENSATION (COMPULSORY SLAUGHTER) - - 638
Cows - - - - - - - - - - 639

DAIRIES AND COWSHEDS:
1. *Prevalence of Disease in the Dairies and Cowsheds in London and in large Towns generally* - - - - - - - 640
2. *Evidence in favour of prohibiting Dairies in the Metropolis and in large Towns* - 640
3. *Exception taken to the foregoing Proposal* - - - - - - - - 641
4. *Inspection and Control; amended Regulations suggested* - - - - - 641
5. *Disinfection* - - - - - - 641
6. *Proposed Quarantine of Dairy Cows from Abroad* - - - - - - 641
7. *Conclusions of the Committee* - - - 641

DEAD MEAT:
1. *Evidence favourable to the Development of a large Dead-meat Trade between the Continent and England, live Cattle being excluded; Prospects of successful Import throughout the Year* - - - - 642

EAD MEAT—continued. PAGE

2. *Evidence at variance with the foregoing Conclusions* - - - - - - 643
3. *Degree of Difficulty on the Score of Ice Supplies for Refrigeration* - - - 644
4. *Question of Introduction of Disease by means of Dead Meat* - - - - 644
5. *Question of Competition with the Home Producer* - - - - - - 645
6. *Amount of Import hitherto* - - - 645
7. *Means of Distribution from London throughout the Country* - - - 645
8. *Facilities of Conveyance from the Country to London; extensive Traffic already carried over the Great Western and other Railways* - - - - - 645
9. *Increased Purchases of Deat Meat by London Butchers* - - - - 645
10. *Conclusions of the Committee* - - 646

DENMARK:

1. *Extent to which Cattle Plague, Pleuro-pneumonia and Foot-and-Mouth Disease have existed in Denmark; preventive Measures taken by Government* - - 646
2. *Export of Cattle to Great Britain and other Countries; Precautions against Disease* - - - - - - - 646
3. *Question of requiring the Slaughter of Cattle from Denmark at the Port of Arrival in England* - - - - 647
4. *Question of a Dead-meat Import from Denmark* - - - - - - - 647

DEPTFORD MARKET:

1. *Number of Animals sent to the Market* - 647
2. *Effect of the Restrictions as to slaughter upon the Supply and upon Prices* - - 648
3. *Increased and regular Supply, and better Competition, if all Foreign Cattle coming to London were slaughtered at Deptford* - - - - - - - - 648
4. *Exceptions taken to the foregoing Proposal* - - - - - - - 648
5. *Provision of Slaughter-houses* - - 648
6. *Sanitary Condition* - - - - 649
7. *Inconvenience in Deptford and Islington Markets being held on the same Day* - 649
8. *Corporation Charges* - - - - 649
9. *Arrangements for the Distribution of Dead Meat from the Market; Advantage of Direct Railway Communication* - - 649
10. *Mode of treating the Carcases of Diseased Animals* - - - - - - - 649

Fairs and Markets - - - - - - - - 650

FARMERS - - - - - - - - - - 650

FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE:

1. *Origin of the Disease in this Country; its Infectious Character* - - - - 652
2. *Extensive Import of Diseased Animals* - 652
3. *Losses from the Disease* - - - - 653
4. *Suggestions as to the Restrictions to be enforced; good Effect of the Cattle Plague Regulations* - - - - - 653
5. *Orders of the Privy Council* - - - 654
6. *Amount of Disease at the present Time* - 655
7. *Conclusions of the Committee* - - - 655

FOREIGN CATTLE: PAGE

I. *As to the Import of Live Cattle:*

1. Advocacy of Prohibition of Import in view of the Liability to Cattle Plague and other Diseases - - 655
2. Evidence in defence of continued Facilities of Import - - - 656
3. Amount of Import hitherto - - 657
4. Orders and Regulations of the Privy Council - - - - - - 657

II. *As to the Slaughtering of Foreign Cattle at the Port of Debarkation:*

1. Evidence favourable to an extended System of compulsory Slaughtering of Foreign Cattle - - - 657
2. Evidence adverse to the foregoing Proposal - - - - - - 658
3. Notice necessary before Application of the Proposal - - - - 658
4. Orders and Regulations of the Privy Council - - - - - - 658

III. *As to the Import of Disease by means of Foreign Cattle; conflicting Evidence on the Subject* - - - - - - - 658

IV. *Conclusions and Recommendations of the Committee* - - - - - - 659

GERMANY:

1. *As to the Existence of Cattle Plague in Germany and the Restrictions enforced by the Imperial Government and the Local Authorities* - - - - - - 665
2. *Arrangements for the prompt Transmission of Information to England* - - 666
3. *Inspection* - - - - - - - 666
4. *Compensation and Cost of restrictive Measures* - - - - - - - 666
5. *Amount and Character of the Export to England* - - - - - - 666
6. *Sheep* - - - - - - - - 666
7. *Price of Cattle and Meat* - - - 667
8. *Pleuro-pneumonia and Foot-and-Mouth Disease* - - - - - - 667
9. *Question of prohibiting Imports of Live Cattle from Germany* - - - - 667
10. *Recommendation by the Committee in favour of Prohibition* - - - - 667

HOLLAND:

1. *Regulations and Restrictions for the Suppression of Cattle Plague, Pleuro-pneumonia, and Foot-and-Month Disease* 672
2. *Amount of Disease in the Country; Question of prohibiting Import into England* - - - - - - - 673
3. *Question of a Dead-meat Trade* - - 673
4. *Number and Class of Cattle in Holland* - 674
5. *Practice as to Compensation in cases of Cattle Plague* - - - - - - 675

Home Supply - - - - - - - - - 674

Hull - - - - - - - - - - - 675

Infected Area - - - - - - - - - 676

Inoculation - - - - - - - - - - 677

PAGE

Inspection:
1. *Operation of the present System of Inspection, in reference to Cattle Diseases; its Efficiency or otherwise* - - - 677
2. *Question of Inspection at the Port of Embarkation* - - - - - - 677
3. *Staff; Question of Appointment by Government, or by Local Authorities* - 678
4. *Suggested Employment of the Police* - 678
5. *Conclusions of the Committee* - - - 678

Ireland, and Irish Cattle:
1. *Transit of Live Stock to England; Defects of the Arrangements, and Cruelties practised, greatly to the Deterioration of the Animals, and the Development of Disease* - - - - - - - - 679
2. *Cattle Boats; Extent to which productive of Disease* - - - - - - 679
3. *Scheme of Sir C. A. Wood for Amended Transit Arrangements* - - - - 680
4. *Inspection* - - - - - - - - 680
5. *Proposed Restrictions upon Movement of Cattle in Ireland; similar Regulations desirable for Ireland and England* 680
6. *Import into Ireland* - - - - - 681
7. *Store Cattle* - - - - - - - 681
8. *Pleuro-pneumonia* - - - - - - 681
9. *Foot-and-Mouth Disease* - - - - 681
10. *Generally as to the Amount of Disease in Ireland* - - - - - - - - 681
11. *Great Increase in the Value of Live Stock* - - - - - - - - 681
12. *Question of a Dead-meat Trade with England* - - - - - - - 681
13. *Recommendations by the Committee* - - 682

Liverpool - - - - - - - - - 685

Local Authorities - - - - - - - 685

Loss from Disease - - - - - - - 686

Manchester and Salford - - - - - - 689

Meat Supply - - - - - - - - - 690

Metropolis - - - - - - - - - 692

Metropolitan Cattle Market - - - - - 692

PAGE

Milk - - - - - - - - - - - 693

Movement of Cattle - - - - - - - 694

Offal:
1. *Objections to a Dead-meat Trade, on account of the Difficulty and Loss on the Score of Offal* - - - - - 697
2. *Evidence at variance with the foregoing Conclusions* - - - - - - - 698
3. *Other Details generally* - - - 698

Pleuro-pneumonia:
1. *Origin of the Disease in this Country; Weight of Evidence as to its Introduction from Abroad* - - - - - - 699
2. *Long Period of Incubation* - - - 700
3. *Prevalence of the Disease; Losses entailed* - - - - - - - - 700
4. *Suggestions as to the Restrictions to be enforced* - - - - - - - 700
5. *Regulations of the Privy Council* - - 701
6. *Conclusions of the Committee* - - - 701

Ports (Landing of Foreign Cattle) - - - - 702

Price of Meat:
1. *As to past and present Prices, and the Causes of Increase* - - - - - 703
2. *As to the Effect of a Prohibition upon Import, and of compulsory Slaughter at the Home or Foreign Port* - - - 703

Privy Council - - - - - - - - 704

Quarantine - - - - - - - - - 705

Railways - - - - - - - - - 706

Russia - - - - - - - - - - 712

Schleswig-Holstein - - - - - - - - 713

Scotland - - - - - - - - - 713

Sheep - - - - - - - - - - 714

Spain and Portugal - - - - - - - 718

Store Capital - - - - - - - - - 719

Sweden and Norway - - - - - - - 721

Transit of Cattle - - - - - - - - 722

Uniformity of Regulations - - - - - 722

I N D E X.

[*N.B.*—In this Index the Figures following the Names of the Witnesses, and those in the Analysis of Evidence, refer to the Questions in the Evidence; the Figures following *App.* refer to the Pages in the Appendix; and the Numerals following *Rep.* to the Pages in the Report.]

B.

ABERDEENSHIRE. Large and increasing trade in dead meat from Aberdeen to London; excellent condition in which the meat arrives, and high prices realised, *Burkett* 6203–6214. 6340–6343——Room for improvement in the mode of transmission of the Aberdeen meat to London, *ib.* 6301–6307—— Expected continuance of the dead meat supply from Aberdeen, concurrently with that from America; relative increase in the former supply and in the live cattle supply from Scotland, *ib.* 6308–6312. 6340–9347.

Very little dead meat sent from Aberdeen to London in the summer; large losses incurred when the meat has been sent in hot weather, *Gillett* 6648, 6649. 6681, 6682.

Average of from sixty to seventy tons of dead meat sent from Scotland to London daily throughout the hot months, *Rudkin*, 9032, 9033. 9159, 9160.

Reference by the Committee to the large increase of late in the supply of dead meat from Aberdeen to London, *Rep.* vii.

AMERICAN CATTLE (IMPORT OF LIVE STOCK):

1. *Superior Breed and Quality of American Cattle; Way in which fed and fattened.*
2. *Condition on Arrival in England; Loss or Depreciation during the Voyage.*
3. *Extent and Prospects of the Trade.*
4. *Question of Restrictions on the Score of Disease.*

1. *Superior Breed and Quality of American Cattle; Way in which fed and fattened:*

Details of the mode of feeding cattle in America, and of the process of fattening those which are intended for the market; system of alternate feeding on Indian Corn and on grass, *Gillett* 2619. 2624. 2818–2821——Practice of feeding entirely on corn when the grass begins to weaken from the effects of frost, *ib.* 2619——Practice in the States as to the relative number of cattle, sheep, and pigs kept on farms; illustration in witness' case, *ib.* 2621–2626——Variation in quality as regards the cattle coming from different localities; best class of cattle exported to England, *ib.* 2632–2636.

Gradual improvement of the herds of cattle in America by crossing the native cattle with English shorthorns; opinion that the stoppage of importation from England will not have an injurious effect for the next three to five years, *Gillett* 2690, 2691. 2697. 2722–2733.

Good class of bullocks imported into England from America; opinion that they are nearly equal to English, *Lyon* 3251——Unquestionable superiority of the American stock as compared with the Continental; considerable pains which the Americans have taken to improve their breed by crossing them with some of our best animals, *ib.* 3270. 3321, 3322.

Superior quality of American cattle; high prices realised when imported alive, *Gebhardt* 5428, 5429. 5512. 5533. 5565–5569 —— Decidedly superior character of American cattle, *Wilson* 5013, 5014; *Burkett* 6440, 6441.

Report, 1877—*continued.*

American Cattle (*Import of Live Stock*)—continued.

2. *Condition on Arrival in England; Loss or Depreciation during the Voyage:*

Insignificant amount of depreciation in the value of live stock in transit from America; recent landing of two cargoes without the loss of a single animal on the passage, *Swan* 1669. 1770–1772——Greater risk in the transit of live cattle than of dead meat; that is, on account of the danger of loss in winter, *Gillett* 2734–2737. 2760–2765.

Reference to a cargo of live cattle landed at Thames Haven in June 1876 from America as having arrived in magnificent condition, *Hall* 2905–2909. 2939——Comparative cost of importing live animals and dead meat into England; admission that the cost is greater in the former case but the meat is much better, *ib.* 2911–2920——Argument that the profits of the import of live cattle from America are sufficiently large to cover the possible losses which occur in rough weather, *ib.* 2921, 2922. 2940–2942. 3007.

Variable condition of the live animals on arrival from America; occasional deterioration of the meat on account of the fatigue caused by the journey, *Lyon* 3257–3269. 3313–3318——Recent arrival of 1,500 American cattle of the best quality within seven days; comparison between the price of these cattle and of American dead meat selling at the same time in the Manchester market, *Lambert* 4003–4007. 4070–4075.

Very good condition in which the live cattle from America generally arrive at Glasgow, the meat being of excellent quality, *Hamilton* 4250–4258——Increasing import of American live cattle *viâ* Southampton; very fine quality and condition of these beasts and very high prices realised by them, *Gillett* 6510–6516. 6643. 6646. 6650, 6651. 6686–6690. 6708–6714.

Excellent condition in which the American cattle arrive at Liverpool; greater care taken and better accommodation in the American than in the Irish boats, *Luya* 7514–7523. 7637. 7678–7681. 7741–7746——High prices realised by the American cattle; comparison with the dead meat prices, *ib.* 7533-7537. 7653-7658. 7734–7738——Loss of some animals during the voyage from America, *ib.* 7678, 7679. 7739, 7740.——Belief that with increased experience live cattle may be brought from America in perfect safety throughout the winter, *ib.* 7746——Very good condition in which some American cattle have been landed at Hull, *Walker* 7904–7907; *Knowles* 9265–9273.

3. *Extent and Prospect of the Trade:*

Belief that within the next twenty years 20,000 cattle a day could be supplied to England if they were required, *Gillett* 2842——Growing character of the trade; belief that during the present year there will be 20,000 American cattle landed in England, *Hall* 2909, 2910——Efforts made to send live cattle from America on account of the uncertainty of the dead meat trade, *Gebhardt* 5428, 5429. 5565-5572. 5743, 5744.

Obstacle to the profitable import of American live stock during the winter, *Hamilton* 4252–4254——Doubt whether the live cattle trade can compete with the dead meat trade, *Burkett* 6442–6444——Recent origin of the American live cattle trade, *Luya* 7515, 7516. 7650–7652.

Considerable losses incurred in the live cattle trade from America, so that it is likely to be superseded by the dead meat trade, *Robinson* 8644–8646——Probability of some live cattle being still imported from America, concurrently with dead meat, *Read* 9556.

4. *Question of Restrictions on the Score of Disease:*

Explanation that witness does not propose to prohibit American import, but only to apply careful restrictions, *Wilson* 5013-5018. 5035. 5080-5082. 5108-5115——Liability to the import of pleuro-pneumonia by means of American cattle, *Gamgee* 6997——Grounds for the opinion that live cattle from America and Canada should be slaughtered at the port of landing, *Adams* 8013–8015. 8040——Opinion that the import should be prohibited, though the cattle doubtless arrive in good condition, *Robinson* 8702–8706.

Recent instances of suspected lung disease in some American cattle landed at Southampton; insufficient grounds for such suspicion, *Brown* 10010, 10011——Facility desirable to be given to the import of American and Canadian cattle, so long as there is no disease in those countries, *ib.* 10045-10047. 10258——Belief that there is not now any foot-and-mouth disease in the United States, *ib.* 10224–10226.

Report, 1877—*continued.*

American Dead Meat:

I. *Supply:*

1. Amount of Import hitherto of American Beef.
2. Prospects of increased Import; conflicting Views on this Point.
3. Very large available Supply in the States.

II. *Practice as to Slaughter before Shipment.*

III. *Arrangements before Shipment and on board Ship; Process of Refrigeration, and Effect thereof.*

IV. *Freight; relative Cost in the case of Dead Meat and Live Cattle.*

V. *Quality and Condition of American Beef:*

1. Adverse Evidence as to the Condition of the Meat on Arrival in this Country, especially in Hot Weather.
2. Favourable Testimony as to the Quality and Condition of the Meat, save under exceptional Circumstances.
3. Curing Properties of American Meat.
4. Quantity condemned as spoiled.

VI. *Storage and Transit in this Country.*

VII. *Price:*

1. In America.
2. In England.

VIII. *Extent and Character of the Demand in London and in the Provinces.*

IX. *Practice of Butchers as to the Sale of American Meat.*

X. *Pork and Mutton.*

XI. *Conclusions of the Committee.*

I. *Supply:*

1. Amount of Import hitherto of American Beef:

Considerable increase in the import of dead meat from America, though not so much in the summer months, *Brown* 1073-1077—Continued consignments of dead meat from America by witness' ships to Bristol, *Whitwell* 2006, 2007——Large development in the trade of dead meat from America since its commencement, *Gillett* 2629, 2630——Shipments to the extent of 1,400 animals weekly from New York, *ib.* 2780-2782——Statement that the trade in American meat to Liverpool has considerably fallen off, *Hall* 3053-3058.

Consignments of dead meat received by witness since October 1875; several cargoes of hogs also received by him from America, *Link* 3062-3065. 3142, 3143——Considerable increase of the trade since its commencement, *ib.* 3066. 3071. 3078. 3101-3103. 3035, 3036——Statement as to the quantity brought in weekly to the London market, *ib.* 3121-3123——Established rather than experimental character of the trade; statistics hereon as to its gradual increase since its commencement in October 1875, *Sheldon* 4504-4509.

Modified success of dead meat import from America, whilst but very little has as yet come from elsewhere, *Gebhardt* 5468. 5702, 5703——Approval of a fair trial being given to the American supply; large increase in the supply since the more stringent restrictions upon import from the Continent, *ib.* 5777-5781.

Witness (who is a salesman of American and English dead meat in the Metropolitan Meat Market) receives some large consignments of American meat, *Burkett* 6105-6108——Coutinued import of American meat, notwithstanding the losses, as there are outstanding contracts, *Giblett* 6747——Statement as to the American meat trade in Liverpool having greatly fallen off, though the quantity passing through the port into the country has increased, *Luya* 7570-7579. 7686-7689——Falling off in the dead meat trade at the present time (July 1877), *Brown* 10018.

2. Prospects of increased Import; conflicting Views on this Point:

Decided belief that if the importation of dead meat as well as live cattle were prohibited from Continental countries there would be an undiminished supply of dead meat from America, *Brown* 999——Information respecting the trade in dead meat from America to Glasgow; opinion that this source of supply is not one upon which we can rely, *Swan* 1652-1668. 1702. 1707-1722. 1782-1800. 1845-1849. 1859-1875.

Decided opinion that the trade in dead meat will continue to develop, there being no limit to the amount which America can provide, *Whitwill* 1901, 1902. 1971-1973——Undoubted opinion that the dead meat trade from America will become a permanent and regular business; belief that this meat can compete successfully with meat killed in this

Report, 1877—*continued.*

AMERICAN DEAD MEAT—continued.

I. *Supply*—continued.

2. Prospects of increased Import, &c.—*continued.*

country, *Gillett* 2669-2673. 2695-2697. 2703-2707. 2757-2759. 2802-2804. 2828, 2829. 2841, 2842. 2853.

Decided opinion that American meat will never be a substitute for English beef, *Hall* 2883——Dissent from the opinion of Mr. Gillett that the American dead meat trade will become established in England; decided preference for the live meat trade, *ib.* 2904——Considerations as to the effect upon the foreign supply of live cattle by a continuous supply of dead meat from America, *Lyon* 3537-3542.

Information in regard to the American dead meat trade with Manchester and Salford; opinion that in the hot weather this trade cannot be successfully carried on, *Lambert* 3817-3861. 3993-4002. 4012-4034. 4046-4048——Further statement that the importation of American dead meat will not succeed; more rapid decomposition of this meat than English meat, *ib.* 4096-4124. 4133-4140. 4163-4170.

Statement showing that it is intended to permanently continue the American dead meat trade with Glasgow, *Hamilton* 4235-4238. 4334-4339. 4385, 4386. 4416——Prospect of a very large increase in the import of American meat, the present prices being remunerative, *Sheldon* 4493-4506.

Comparative infancy of the American dead meat trade, it being difficult to say whether it will last, *Gebhardt* 5193-5197. 5468. 5702, 5703——Opinion that an exclusively dead meat trade could not be properly carried on even if American meat could be always supplied in good condition, without spoiling by keeping, *ib.* 5749-5753.

Evidence in support of the conclusion that the price of dead meat from America will increase, and that this supply cannot be depended upon in lieu of a live cattle supply from the Continent, *Pool* 5839-5895. 5960-5979. 6010-6034. 6082-6104.

Grounds for the conclusion that largely increased supplies of American beef in good condition may safely be calculated upon, *Burkett* 6236, 6237. 6261-6266. 6372-6376. 6415, 6416. 6445-6448——Very large increase anticipated in the dead-meat trade from America, especially if live cattle were excluded, *Stratton* 6799. 6805; *Robinson* 8643-8646.

Prospect of very large supples from America in good condition; great improbability however of the Continental live meat supply being superceded, *Rudkin* 9022. 9115, 9116. 9207——Expected permanence of the American meat trade, *Read* 9556.

3. Very large available Supply in the States:

Statement that the supply of meat from America may be considered to be practically unlimited, *Gillett* 2695-2699. 2751——Ample supplies of dead meat to be had from America in lieu of the foreign cattle supply, *Sheldon* 4574-4578. 4588-4592. 4601-4609.

Information relative to the total number of cattle, of sheep, and of pigs, in the States, and the number of each class available annually for slaughter; conclusion as to the very large surplus which may be spared for the supply of England, *Sheldon* 4440-4444. 4591, 4592. 4601-4609.

Immense supply of cattle in America (including some 10,000,000 in Texas) available for export to England in the form of dead meat, *Gamgee* 6989-6991——Question considered as to the accuracy of witness' computation that there are 10,000,000 cattle in Texas, *ib.* 7058-7060*——Large surplus supplies of cattle in the States, though there may be a slight rise in prices through the English demand, *ib.* 7156, 7157.

Great capabilities of Texas and other States, but not to supply an unlimited quantity, *Howard* 8391.

II. *Practice as to Slaughter before Shipment:*

Considerable distance which cattle have to travel in America before being slaughtered at the abattoirs in New York, *Whitwell* 1998-2002——Explanation of the reason for sending the live cattle to New York instead of killing them, and preparing them at Chicago, *Gillett* 2679-2689——Carriage of the meat some miles to the place of shipment from the slaughter-house, *ib.* 2775-2779——Bad appearance of the American meat, owing very much to the mode of slaughtering, *Read* 9546, 9547.

III. *Arrangements before Shipment and on board Ship; Process of Refrigeration, and Effect thereof:*

Information as to the means adopted in witness' steamers for carrying dead meat from America to Bristol; opinion that the meat, if properly cared for as regards temperature may be kept sound for an indefinite period, *Whitwell* 1877-1885. 1913-1926. 1989-1991——Description of the manner in which the meat chambers on the steamers are kept

Report, 1877—*continued.*

American Dead Meat—continued.

III. *Arrangemeats before Shipment and on board Ship, &c.*—continued.

kept at an even temperature; great importance of maintaining the required temperature without varlation, *Whitwell* 1882–1885. 1947–1950. 1965–1969. 1986–1988——Further description of the manner in which the temperature of the meat chamber on board ship is reduced; examination of the temperature by means of a thermometer let into the door, which is never opened until the vessel arrives, *ib.* 2004.

Information respecting the process of preparing the meat for shipment; great care necessary in the refrigerating practice, *Gillett* 2631. 2640–2652. 2714–2718. 2775–2779. 2837–2840. 2851–2853——Necessity for refrigerators equally in winter as in summer; the temperature must not be too low when the meat is cooling, *ib.* 2770. 2856——Further information relative to the refrigeration of the meat before shipment; supply of all necessary machinery and ice by the owner of the meat, *ib.* 2783–2792——Method adopted by the butchers in New York for preserving the meat for daily use, *ib.* 2830–2833.

Strong approval of the process by which the meat is brought over from America in a cold dry temperature, *Link* 3081, 3082——Impossibility for any smell to come from the meat-chambers on board the passenger ships, *ib.* 3124–3127——Adoption of the plan of having separate chambers on the vessel, so that part of the cargo can be dealt with at a time, *ib.* 3130–3132. 3137.

Practice of preparing the carcases on shore before shipment, there being sometimes an interval of two or three days; small cost of the process, *Sheldon* 4450–4455——Inspection by witness of the "dry air" process used in the conveyance of some of the meat cargoes from America; testimony to the perfect condition on arrival at Liverpool of the meat subjected to this process, *ib.* 4473–4485——Accidental defects owing to which some cargoes have arrived in bad condition; belief that these defects can be effectually provided against, *ib.* 4499–4502.

Authority for the conclusion that as a result of the refrigerating process the meat from America is perfectly capable of resisting heat and atmospheric changes, *Wilson* 4858–4867. 4870–4908——Probability of increased care in transmission with a view to the permanent establishment of a profitable trade, *Gebhardt* 5193–5197; *Luya* 7580–7588——Conclusion that by care in packing and by not placing too many quarters in the same chamber the good condition of the meat may be perfectly secured, and a remunerative price obtained, *Burkett* 6132–6142.

Particulars relative to experiments by witness, in Texas, in 1869, which resulted in the application of the dry, cold air process, since adopted in the American dead-meat trade, *Gamgee* 7020–7022.

IV. *Freight; relative Cost in the case of Dead Meat and Live Cattle:*

Examination respecting the cost of freight and transit generally from America to this country, *Whitwell* 1933–1938. 1945, 1946—— Difficulty in bringing a whole cargo of dead meat on account of the ship not being low enough in the water, *ib.* 1949, 1950——The proportion of dead meat to the live animals is at the rate of about a ton of dead meat to three bullocks, *ib.* 2674–2678——Absence of difficulty in the transit of meat so far as the sea passage is concerned, *ib.* 2712——Non-variation in the rates of shipment from New York to England since the commencement; convenience in carrying dead meat instead of live animals, *ib.* 2793–2804. 2861, 2862.

Explanation that the cost of freight, excluding all the machinery and appliances on board ship, is between 3 *l.* and 4 *l.* per carcase, *Link* 3098. 3104–3110.

Calculations as to the cost of rearing and feeding a bullock in the States, the cost up to the time of shipment to this country in the form of dead meat, and the cost of freight; aggregate of about 18 *l.*, *Sheldon* 4445–4466——Cost of about 7 *l.* for the freight of a live animal, and of 1 *l.* 12 *s.* for attendance and food on board, *ib.* 4467–4471——Estimate of about 30 *s.* per carcase as the cost of ocean transit, *ib.* 4456–4461——Very low freights at present; increase of price if the freights go up, *Pool* 5842. 5971. 6094, 6095.

V. *Quality and Condition of American Beef:*

1. Adverse Evidence as to the Condition of the Meat on Arrival in this Country, especially in Hot Weather:

Considerable variation in the condition of the meat which arrives at Glasgow in hot weather; belief that in hot weather the trade will inevitably decline, *Swan* 1659–1662. 1664, 1665. 1708. 1752–1784.

Unsatisfactory result of the importation of dead meat into Liverpool, especially with regard to supplies for shipping; statement that the action of the air upon this meat is highly prejudicial both to its appearance and quality, *Hall* 2866–2872. 2881–2883. 2889, 2890. 2901–2903. 2945–2953——Inferior condition of the meat resulting from the failure of ice on the vessels in hot weather, *ib.* 2879–2881. 2963–2966.

AMERICAN DEAD MEAT—continued.

V. *Quality and Condition of American Beef*—continued.

1. Adverse Evidence as to the Condition of the Meat, &c.—*continued.*

Statement that the ice used in the preservation of the meat is destructive to its flavour, *Hall* 2911. 3016, 3017——Belief that American meat can never be imported into England as sound and good as English beef, *ib.* 2998, 2999——Objection to the meat on account of its soft and moist appearance, *ib.* 3025–3031.

Inferior condition of the American meat caused by over-packing, and by bringing too much in proportion to the accommodation, *Lyon* 3264——Method adopted for trimming and cleansing the meat, which though sound and good is apparently in bad condition, *ib.* 3266——Reference to the taste of the American meat when cooked; opinion that it is not quite so good as English meat when cold, *ib.* 3380, 3381. 3395–3398. 3543——Instance in August, in the very hottest weather, of a cargo of meat arriving in capital condition; contention, however, that accidents will always render dead meat liable to deterioration in condition of price, *ib.* 3432–3442. 3449–3454——Considerable difficulties at present in the way of bringing meat from America in a throughly good and sound state, *ib.* 3548–3553.

Mixed quality of the meat which has come from America into Manchester, *Lambert* 3832–3835——Decided opinion that it is impracticable to move meat without deterioration after it has been subject to the influence of ice; impossibility of carrying on this trade unless the meat is sold within two days of its arrival, *ib.* 3853–3855.

Good condition and excellent quality of some American meat on arrival in this country, whilst on the other hand a large quantity is in very bad condition, is quite unfit for food, and is sold for about 1½ *d.* per pound, *Gebhardt* 5186–5192. 5250, 5251——Unreliable character of the American supply further adverted to; necessity moreover of submitting to a great reduction of price in order to sell the meat quickly, *ib.* 5418. 5422–5426. 5570——Further admission as to the excellent condition in which some of the American meat arrives, so that the whole supply may in time be placed on a satisfactory footing, *ib.* 5532–5539. 5774.

Unsatisfactory results of witness' experience as regards the condition in which several consignments of American meat have arrived; question considered whether the difficulties on this score may not be overcome in time, *Pool* 5847–5869. 5960–5970. 6033, 6034. 6057–6066. 6096–6099——Bad condition of two consignments sent under the dry air process, *ib.* 5852, 5853.

Extent and result of witness' experience in connection with dead meat from America; very indifferent condition in which several cargoes have arrived, and very low prices fetched as compared with the prices of American live stock, *Giblett* 6517–6555. 6691–6693——Grounds for the conclusion that dead meat will continue to be sent from America in large quantities during winter, but that in hot weather it cannot be sent without great loss, *ib.* 6543–6557. 6638–6649. 6691–6693. 6739–6744. 6756–6760——Excellent quality of the American meat, though it sometimes comes in very bad condition, and is only suitable for a winter trade, *ib.* 6740–6744.

Evidence in detail relative to the American dead meat trade with Liverpool, the quality of the meat, the price realised, &c.; adverse conclusions as to the success of this trade, though a large portion of the meat arrives in good condition, *Luya* 7560–7615. 7659. 7660——Deterioration of meat when much handled; reference hereon to the discoloured and repulsive appearance of some American meat, *ib.* 7561. 7579. 7602. 7659, 7660. 7694–7699. 7710–7712——Effect of the cold air process, and of subsequent exposure after landing, in prejudicially affecting the taste of the meat, *ib.* 7589–7594. 7602–7610.

Further examination upon the question whether American meat may not in time be brought over in a generally improved condition, so that the prejudice in Liverpool against the meat may be overcome, *Luya* 7707–7733.

Particulars relative to the American meat supplies to Leeds; very indifferent condition in which the meat has arrived, whilst the demand has greatly fallen off, witness believing that the trade cannot be maintained at a profit, *Walker* 7805–7817. 7821–7824. 7861–7879——Inferior condition of the meat on arrival at Leeds, as compared with meat from Scotland, *ib.* 7875–7880——Objectionable condition in which the "iced" meat, so called, frequently arrives at Hull, *Knowles* 9278. 9312–9316.

2. Favourable Testimony as to the Quality and Condition of the Meat, save under exceptional Circumstances:

Regular consignments of dead meat received at Bristol from America since last April, the condition being usually good; belief that every cargo might arrive in good condition if thorough care were taken, *Whitwell* 1925, 1926. 1953–1964. 1992–1995. 2006, 2007——Possibility of bringing this meat in hot weather as well as in cold, proved by the experience of last summer; expense of transit not greater in hot than in cold weather, *ib.* 2003, 2004.

Statement

American Dead Meat—continued.

V. *Quality and Condition of American Beef*—continued.

2. Favourable Testimony as to the Quality and Condition, &c.—*continued.*

Statement that hot weather is in no way prejudicial to the trade if it be properly prepared, *Gillett* 2659-2664——Deterioration of some of the earlier cargoes of meat not on account of the hot weather, but because the machinery for regulating the temperature broke down in one instance, whilst in two instances sufficient ice had not been taken, *ib.* 2706-2710——Assertion that the meat, if properly prepared, will keep longer than any other meat killed in the ordinary way, either English or American, *ib.* 2719-2721. 2759.

Preference for the dead meat trade to England as compared with the live stock trade; great risk attendant upon the latter during the winter, *Gillett* 2734-2737. 2760-2765——Favourable experience as to the condition of the cargoes of dead meat shipped to Liverpool; certainty, when the means of transit are more perfect, of delivering meat in Liverpool as fresh as when it was killed in New York, *ib.* 2752-2759——Explanation with reference to several cargoes lately arrived in England in bad condition; defective preparation in America the real cause of this failure, *ib.* 2766-2771. 2847-2850. 2854-2856.

Information respecting the shipments received by witness from America, and the generally good condition of the meat, *Link* 3069——Statement that the American meat will keep longer than English beef fresh from the slaughter-house; great importance of the meat being chilled right through before being shipped, *ib.* 3086, 3087. 3092-3095. 3099, 3100. 3128-3131. 3137.

Consumption of some American beef by Her Majesty, by clubs, and other West End customers, who have expressed high approval of its quality; impossibility of distinguishing the meat from Scotch beef, *Link* 3088, 3089. 3114. 3133, 3134——Explanation that some meat condemned in the London market became bad on account of the vessel being longer out than usual, and the ice running short, *ib.* 3112, 3113.

Large dealings of witness at Glasgow in dead meat from America, as consigned to Messrs. Bell & Sons; very good condition in which this meat arrives, whilst it will keep nearly as long as home-killed meat, though it losses colour, *Hamilton* 4213-4247. 4277-4279. 4304-4315. 4325, 4326——Necessity on only one occasion of selling a cargo of dead meat at a reduced price on account of its condition on arrival at Glasgow, *ib.* 4363-4365.

Practical trial given by witness to some beef brought over in the "Celtic" in March last; excellence of the quality, both hot and cold, whilst it was kept for several days before it was cooked, *Sheldon* 4486-4494——Belief that the meat can come just as well in hot weather as in cold, *ib.* 4510-4513——Opinion as to the good quality of the American dead meat sent to this country, and as to the excellent condition in which it arrives, *Wilson* 4853-4857.

Excellent condition as a rule of Mr. Link's consignments on arrival in London, though of late there have been some exceptions; peculiarly good condition of a cargo which came in extremely hot weather, *Burkett* 6109-6117. 6130-6135——Excellent quality of American beef, when it arrives in good condition; it is, in fact, surpassed only by Aberdeen beef, *ib.* 6149-6151. 6227-6235——Very good condition of some of Mr. Gillett's consignments of American meat, *ib.* 6152-6159.

Particulars as to the keeping properties of American meat in hot and cold weather; it will keep better than English meat, but not so well as that from Aberdeen, *Burkett* 6160-6170. 6267-6270. 6301, 6302——Very bad condition of some American meat sold by Mr. Pool, as agent; negligence to which owing, *ib.* 6171-6176——Better quality of American than of Continental dead meat, so that the latter can hardly stand competition with the former, *ib.* 6227-6230——Very large quantity sent by Mr. Eastman, the quality being excellent, *ib.* 6237, 6238——Very good condition of some American meat sent from Glasgow to the London market, *ib.* 6240-6245.

Excellent condition in which meat arrives from America in hot weather, *Stratton* 6799-6805——Admirable condition in which the meat may be brought under proper arrangements, *Robinson* 8644.

Exceedingly good condition in which some American meat has recently come to London, *viâ* Liverpool; very fine quality of this meat, which realised 7*d.* per pound, *Rudkin* 9006-9011——Belief that the bad condition in which the meat sometimes arrives is due to bad packing, and to the slaughter of the animals in America before they have cooled down after their journey from the interior; facility of correcting these defects, *ib.* 9016-9021. 9117, 9118. 9194-9196——Long period for which American meat will keep if it arrives in good condition, *ib.* 9183, 9184.

Excellent condition in which cargoes of American meat have arrived, even in hot weather; bad condition, on the other hand, of some cargoes through imperfection in the process adopted, or from other causes which are remediable, *Read* 9444-9555.

Report, 1877—*continued.*

AMERICAN DEAD MEAT—continued.

V. *Quality and Condition of American Beef*—continued.

3. Curing Properties of American Meat:

Fitness of the American dead meat for curing, *Hamilton* 4314-4317——Result of witness' experience that American meat will take salt perfectly, *Rudkin* 9022, 9023.

Statement that American meat will not salt, so that the sailors at Hull will not use it, *Knowles* 9250-9252. 9307-9311.

4. Quantity condemned as Spoiled:

Statement that since the commencement of the trade 7 per cent. would represent the loss by bad meat on the total shipments, *Gillett* 2810-2813——Seizure in London during the present week of thirty tons of Canadian and American meat, *Hall* 2899-2901. 3033-3035.

Statistical information in regard to the importation of American dead meat into London during the present year; within the last week many tons of this meat were condemned as being unfit for food, *Lyon* 3158-3163. 3260-3263. 3382-3394——Variable character of the meat when put upon the market; large losses which have occurred through the meat becoming bad on account of delay in transit, through bad weather, and other causes, *ib.* 3175-3177. 3245-3248. 3310——Belief that in the week in which so large a quantity of meat was condemned, there could not have been a less loss than 20,000*l.*; sale of some of this meat on the 1st June at the rate of 1*s.* 8*d.* per stone, *ib.* 3245-3248. 3310, 3311. 3505-3510——British beef occasionally condemned in the London markets as well as American, *ib.* 3476, 3477.

Necessity of daily boiling down a considerable quantity of the meat, *Gebhardt* 5190. 5250——Condemnation of some American meat in Liverpool, but not in hot weather especially, *Luya* 7608-7610.

Condemnation of about forty-nine tons of American meat by the city authorities in the first six months of 1877, *Rudkin* 9012-9015.

VI. *Storage and Transit in this Country:*

Opinion that the meat will bear transit from the port of arrival to other markets, without fear of deterioration from being exposed to a higher temperature than that of the refrigerator; this is conditional on the meat being properly prepared at first, *Gillett* 2642-2647. 2649-2652—— Absence of necessity for dead meat stores specially prepared for carrying on the trade in the English markets, *ib.* 2657, 2658.

Mode of conveying the meat from Liverpool to London by train; specially constructed trucks for this purpose, *Link* 3067. 3083-3085. 3145——Facilities of butchers by means of refrigerated storehouses for keeping large supplies of American meat for about a week, and so regulating the market, *Burkett* 6167-6170. 6179-6181. 6398-6401.

Facility for making improved arrangements for the storage and transit of dead meat on arrival from America, *Gumgee* 7095-7103. 7120-7126. 7217——Improved arrangements required both in England and America in connection with the dead meat trade; these are quite feasible, *ib.* 7217-7222——The trade can be carried on as well (with proper arrangements) in summer as in winter, *ib.* 7217.

Steps being taken in Liverpool for providing cool stores in which to keep dead meat until it is wanted for use, *Luya* 7595-7607——Importance of cool stores in which to keep the meat on arrival; steps being taken to provide these on a large scale, *Read* 9550-9553.

VII. *Price:*

1. In America:

Average price of meat in American towns about half that in England, *Brown* 363, 364——Rise in price in America on account of the increased demand in England, *Whitwell* 2004-2007—— Statement that 6*d.* is the average price for prime beef in New York, *Gillett* 2742.

Tendency to a rise in the price of cattle in America; reference hereon to the margin of profit between the price of dead meat in New York and in London, *Pool* 5971-5979. 6010-6020——Increasing price of cattle in the United States and Canada, *Gillett* 6546-6550. 6591-6595. 6654-6656. 6739.

2. In England:

Information in regard to the price at which the meat has been put upon the market at Bristol; absence of fluctuation in price for good meat, *Whitwell* 1906-1912. 1927-1931. 1975-1986. 1996, 1997. 2008, 2009——Examination with reference to the price at which it will be necessary to sell the meat so as to make the trade remunerative; possibility of going as low as 5½*d.* a pound, *Gillett* 2637-2639. 2693, 2694. 2700-2702. 2738-2744. 2760-2765. 2772-2774. 2814-2817. 2843-2846——Argument that the fall in

AMERICAN DEAD MEAT—continued.

VII. *Price*—continued.

2. In England—*continued.*

in price of American meat in English markets is due, not to deterioration of quality, but to the fact that the market was over-stocked, *Gillett* 2654-2656.

Statement that the price of large quantities of this meat in London has been as low as 2 *d.* and 3 *d.* a pound; the highest price has been 7 *d.*, but that was on account of the great scarcity of meat at the time, *Hall* 2877, 2878. 2934. 2957, 2958. 2991-2997. 3010-3015. 3036-3038. 3041. 3049——Comparison of the price of live stock from America with that of dead meat; advantage as regards cheapness in favour of the latter, *ib.* 2970-2972——Dead loss to the importer of the meat which is selling at the present low prices, *ib.* 3000-3006.

High price at which the meat is sometimes sold in London, *Link* 3070, 3071. 3090, 3091——Low price at which the American meat can be sold in London; fluctuation in price dependent upon the character of the meat, *Lyon* 3172-3175. 3264, 3265——Calculation by the importers of dead meat that it cannot be remunerative at a lower price than 6½ *d.*; argument that the meat which has already come to London must have been a great loss as it has realised nothing like this price, *ib.* 3235-3238. 3245-3248. 3253-3256. 3369-3373.

Somewhat lower price realised at Glasgow by American than by home-killed meat, the former being readily bought by the public, *Hamilton* 4232, 4233. 4309-4313. 4421-4431——Liability to great variation in the price of American dead meat in Glasgow, *ib.* 4331-4340——Large margin of profit in sending dead meat instead of live cattle, *Sheldon* 4472——Profitable character of the present prices in the American trade; improbability of any material increase of price, *ib.* 4593-4600.

Gradual reduction from 7 *d.* to 2 *d.* per pound realised by a recent cargo of American meat, whilst a considerable quantity had to be destroyed, *Gebhardt* 5423, 5424. 5570——Belief that but for the American supply meat would have been much dearer in Manchester and other towns, *ib.* 5642. 5646——Examination as to the relative price at which dead meat from America and cattle from the Continent can be sold to the public at a profit, and as to the extent of margin in favour of the former; doubt as to the American trade paying at 6 *d.* per pound, *ib.* 5735-5768.

Average of about 4¾ *d.* per pound realised by the American meat sold by witness in London; examination hereon to the effect that witness does not believe the trade is a remunerative one, notwithstanding its immense increase, *Pool* 5857-5860. 5870-5880. 6010-6032. 6095.

Average of about 6¾ *d.* in the pound realised by Mr. Link's consignments from January to May last; average of about 5¼ *d.* as the price fetched by American meat in the previous four months, *Burkett* 6118-6130. 6277-6285——Lower price by about 1¼ *d.* per pound of the best American beef than of English beef, whilst it is about 2 *d.* cheaper than Aberdeen beef, *ib.* 6271, 6272.

Sale of the meat in Liverpool at prices varying from 4 *d.* to 6½ *d.* a pound, *Luya* 7613-7615——Calculation to the effect that American meat will bring a profit at any price over 4½ *d.* a pound, *Robinson* 8644. 8697, 8698——Great boon to the public if the American supply came over in such quantity as to supersede the live cattle supply from the Continent, and to reduce the price of meat, *Rudkin* 9025-9030.

VIII. *Extent and Character of the Demand in London and in the Provinces:*

Absence of any difficulty in finding markets for the meat on its arrival in Liverpool; supply occasionally sent to Manchester or Birmingham on account of its obtaining a better price, *Gillett* 2805-2809——Admission that the introduction of American meat has been a great boon to the poor people, who would have suffered greatly without it; opinion on the other hand that the richer classes would not touch it on account of its insipidity and want of flavour, *Hall* 2881-2883. 2998. 3008, 3009. 3038-3040.

Circumstances under which witness declined to supply American meat to steamers at Liverpool; instances in which some steamers took their business away from him in consequence, and afterwards returned to him with larger orders for English meat, *Hall* 2896-2899. 2945-2949. 2978-2980. 3022-3024——Unwillingness of the owners of vessels to give the American meat to their own crews or passengers, *ib.* 3019-3024——Supply of passenger ships by witness with American meat for consumption on board, *Link* 3116-3119. 3132, 3133.

Explanation that the large quantities in the metropolis in some weeks are to be accounted for by the meat not being good enough for the provinces, so that it has been sent up to London; very low prices realised by some meat, which was mouldy and apparently in bad condition, *Lyon* 3160-3163. 3266-3269. 3308-3311. 3388-3390. 3431——Admission as to the great advantage to this country on account of the introduction

Report, 1877—*continued.*

American Dead Meat—continued.

VIII. *Extent and Character of the Demand in London, &c.*—continued.

of American meat; extensive sale of the meat by London butchers, *Lyon* 3164, 3165. 3229. 3306. 3336. 3339-3344. 3353-3355. 3374-3379. 3402-3406. 3433-3439.

Dislike of American meat in Birmingham and Manchester, so that it does not enter into competition with other meat as regards price, *Gebhardt* 5771-5776 — Prejudice against American beef on account of the bad colour, though not really any symptom of inferior quality; comment upon its exclusion from Government establishments and from workhouses, *Burkett* 6233-6233. 6296-6300. 6320-6328——Objection in the provinces to the use of American meat in summer, the colour being against it, *ib.* 6377-6382.

Belief that the majority of those who try American dead meat have a distaste for it, *Giblett* 6536, 6537——Very bad appearance of the meat; statement hereon as to its being objected to by the army and navy, and by prison and workhouse authorities, *ib.* 6538-6542——Advantage of supplies of American meat in the winter as an auxiliary to the live cattle supply, *ib.* 6652, 6653.

Public dislike of American dead meat in Hull, so that there is no demand for it, *Knowles* 9274-9277——Comment upon the exclusion till lately of American dead meat from Government contracts, *Read* 9558-9560.

IX. *Practice of Butchers as to the Sale of American Meat:*

Stores opened in Liverpool for the sale of this meat, which though at first successful have been closed on account of the sale falling off; many of the ordinary butchers subsequently took up this trade and sold the American meat besides their own, *Hall* 2873-2876. 2926-2929. 2954-2956. 2959-2962——Further examination with reference to the sale of American meat in Liverpool; instance of a butcher in Manchester buying tough and lean old cows and selling them for American meat in order to discredit the trade, *ib.* 2930-2933. 3032.

Extensive purchases of American meat in London by West End butchers, *Link* 3069 ——Probable sale by the London butchers of American meat as British or Scotch meat; doubt as to any complaint being made with reference to this meat by the consumers, *Lyon* 3465-3467. 3544-3547——Comment upon the practice of butchers in selling American for English meat and charging English prices, *Gebhardt* 5421, 5422. 5678, 5679.

Purchase of Mr. Link's consignments by the best butchers when it arrives in good condition, *Burkett* 6143-6151. 6234, 6235. 6286-6288 — Sale of American beef to the public as Scotch beef; large profits thereby to the butchers, *Rudkin* 9024. 9109-9113 ——Comment upon the opposition at first of the London butchers to the consumption of American meat; they now buy it very readily, *ib.* 9114. 9185.

X. *Pork and Mutton:*

Possibility of sending pork and mutton from America in large quantities in the same way as beef, *Gillett* 2823-2827. 2858-2860.

XI. *Conclusions of the Committee:*

Importance attached to the American supply in connection with the proposal that foreign cattle be slaughtered at the port of debarkation, *Rep.* viii——Prospect of the supply being continued throughout the year, with improved arrangements during the summer months, *ib.*——The trade is, however, at present in too uncertain and experimental a condition to justify reliance upon it for an unfailing supply, *ib.*

Animals Order of 1875 (*Privy Council*). Contents of this Order; regulations therein as to the mode of dealing with various diseases, as to the arrangements for the transit of cattle, &c., *App.* 521-539.

Ash, Mr. Belief that Mr. Ash, manager of the Piston Freezing Company, is the inventor of the cold air process as applied to dead meat; great value of this invention, *Sir C. A. Wood* 7363. 7366.

Australia. Statement that it is proposed by Australia to continue the prohibition on the import of cattle until the year 1880; opinion that if this country were in the meantime declared free from disease the trade to Australia would be resumed, *Booth* 2272. 2282. 2285-2288.

Belief that some meat sold as Australian, and objected to on the score of its appearance, was not really Australian, *Burkett* 6289-6296——Expected success of the experiment in the conveyance of refrigerated dead meat on board the "Northam" from Sydney, *Odams* 8002-8004.

Information relative to the stringent regulations enforced in Australia for the suppression and prevention of scab in sheep, and other diseases; success with which attended, *Melvin* 8783-8795——Very large number of live stock in Australasia, there being about 70,000,000

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Australia—continued.

70,000,000 sheep and 7,000,000 cattle, *Melvin* 8830, 8831——Attempts made and being made to import dead meat from Australia; good prospect of success, *ib.* 8832-8836.

Prohibition in Australia upon the import of live cattle from England through fear of disease; importance on this score of freedom from disease at home, as causing improved breeds to be sent to Australia, whence improved and enlarged supplies may be returned to this country, *Melvin* 8837-8843. 8865-8867.

Aylesbury Dairy Company. See *Dairies and Cowsheds.*

B.

Bedfordshire. Very heavy losses of witness, in Bedfordshire, from foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia, *Howard* 8152. 8160, 8161——Very many animals attacked by these diseases in the county about 1872, and heavy losses in consequence; immunity from cattle plague, *ib.* 8156-8165.

Stringent regulations adopted for stamping out the outbreaks; prohibition of fairs and markets temporarily, *Howard* 8166-8174——Speedy re-introduction of foot-and-mouth disease, *ib.* 8175, 8176——Healthy state of the county and of England generally, at the present time, *ib.* 8330, 8331. 8354-8359.

Behr, The Baron Fr. Von. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is a large landed proprietor in Germany, and has come to England in consequence of the present inquiry on the subject of cattle plague, 2464, 2465. 2536, 2537. 2539-2541——Great interest taken in this question by the German farmers, 2466, 2467.

Large import of German cattle and sheep into England; statement that the best sheep and probably the best cattle, are selected for exportation to England, 2467-2471. 2556-2559——Extract from a work by Her Von Bunsen showing the advantage of establishing free trade in cattle; great anxiety on the part of German farmers with reference to any restrictions on the export of cattle to England, 2469-2471.

Impossibility of exporting dead meat from Germany into England on account of the cost of transit; inability to compete with America in this trade as regards cheapness of price, 2472-2480. 2575-2577——Decided opinion that to send offal to England fit for food would be impracticable, 2475-2477——Approval by the German farmers of the existing stringent regulations for the prevention of cattle plague, 2481. 2485, 2486.

Compensation paid by the Imperial Government to the extent of the whole value of slaughtered cattle in the case of rinderpest; expediency of the Empire paying one-half, and the province the other half, 2481. 2527, 2528. 2595-2597——Intention of the Government to make their restrictions more severe; strong opinion of witness in favour of increased severity of regulations, 2482-2484. 2500-2505. 2547-2551.

Information respecting the measures adopted by the German Government for the purpose of stamping disease out of the country; severe punishments inflicted in the case of cattle smuggling into Germany, 2483-2494. 2498-2511. 2547-2551——Regulations with reference to the dangerous boundaries of Russia, 2484-2490. 2560——Local authorities in Germany directed to dispatch to England immediate information of any outbreak of disease, 2490, 2491. 2493——Desire on the part of the Government to meet the wishes of England in regard to any restrictive measures having reference to cattle diseases, 2492. 2510, 2511. 2517——Decided conviction that cattle plague is now completely stamped out in Germany; opening of the boundaries of neighbouring countries in consequence of this freedom from disease, 2495-2497——Great difficulty for the German Government to prevent occasional smuggling somewhere on their extended frontier, 2499-2504. 2598-2600.

Suggestions as to the means to be adopted in England to avoid the importation of disease; desirability of appointing English veterinary inspectors at Continental ports, with instructions to telegraph information of shipment of infected animals, 2512-2516. 2552-2555. 2566-2568. 2593-2594——Expediency of making the law of disinfecting ships an Imperial law, applicable to the whole of Germany, 2517-2519.

Difficulty of arriving at the best means of dealing with pleuro-pneumonia; divided opinion in Germany as to whether the disease has been imported or is indigenous, 2520-2529. 2563. 2569——Unimportance of foot-and-mouth disease in Germany; opinion that this disease is more severe in highly fed than in poor cattle, 2530-2532. 2538. 2542-2544. 2570-2574. 2585-2587——Assertion that cattle plague is the only disease in Germany of permanent importance; insignificance of all other diseases in comparison, 2533-2535. 2563-2565.

Large numbers of English cattle purchased for breeding purposes in Germany, 2537, 2538. 2578-2584——Dissent from the opinion that cattle plague is introduced into England from Germany; difficult mission of the latter country to protect the whole of

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Behr, The Baron Fr. Von. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

Europe against the introduction of the plague from Russia, 2560, 2561——Effect of foot-and-mouth disease upon the milk of cows, 2572, 2573——The price of meat in Germany is, on the average, 7 *d.* a pound for the best parts, 2575-2577.

Decided opinion that the loss which the prohibition of import from England would cause to Germany would not be a tenth part of the loss suffered from a prohibition of the export from Germany to England, 2581–2584——Further statement that it would be impracticable to send dead meat from Germany to England, even if it were wholly packed in ice, 2588–2590.

Desirability of classifying German cattle in the same schedule as French and Spanish cattle, 2591, 2592——Great advantage possessed by England as regards immunity from cattle diseases on account of its insular position, 2601——Wish on the part of the German farmers to co-operate with the English farmers with the object of conquering the frightful disease of cattle plague, 2603.

Belgium. Reference to the prohibition placed upon the import of cattle, meat, and hides from Belgium upon the ground chiefly of Belgium being a country of transit, *Brown* 93, 94——Conclusion as to the necessity, in reference to cattle plague, of prohibiting the import of cattle from Belgium, *Brown* 315-317. 976-978; *Simonds* 1147. 1190, 1191. 1217.

Very little import from Belgium proper, save that some sheep come from that country, *Robinson* 8548, 8549——Non-adoption in Belgium of any special restrictions in reference to pleuro-pneumonia, *Read* 9769——Import of disease from Belgium at times when it was not reported as existing in that country, *Brown* 10054.

Recommendation by the Committee for the prohibition of import of cattle from Belgium, *Rep.* vi. ix.

See also *Cattle Plague. Foot-and-Mouth Disease. Foreign Cattle. Pleuro-pneumonia.*

Birmingham. Admission as to the entire efficiency of local action at Birmingham in dealing with cattle diseases, *Brown* 10153. 10170.

Booth, Thomas Christopher. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Large experience of witness as a breeder of cattle in Yorkshire for many years; high pedigreed shorthorns bred by him, 2234-2242——Very great losses of witness from foot-and-mouth disease; his herd has been reduced more than one half by this disease, 2243–2249. 2267–2271. 2313, 2332–2334. 2341, 2342——Undoubted opinion that foot-and-mouth disease was introduced into the herd by means of strange cattle driven along roads passing through witness' farm, 2246–2248. 2313.

Information respecting the restrictions at present existing with regard to the movement of cattle in Yorkshire; undoubted opinion that the advantages of these stringent restrictions far outweigh the disadvantages, 2250-2261. 2266. 2272–2289. 2296-2300. 2303–2322. 2337——Statement that the present severe restrictions considerably enhance the price of meat; large increase in price within the last ten or fifteen years, 2256. 2308. 2315, 2316. 2320, 2321. 2327–2331.

Great loss to breeders and also to consumers on account of the prohibition of foreign exportation; stoppage also of the Irish trade at the present time, 2257–2261. 2272. 2274. 2284——Large exportation of shorthorns to Ireland by witness and his family during the last sixty years; considerable increase in the value of Irish cattle from this exportation, 2260, 2261. 2343, 2344.

Favourable opinion of witness as to the probable success of the dead meat trade; belief that this trade will eventually usurp the whole of the trade in cattle, 2262-2264. 2293–2295. 2323–2326. 2361. 2423——Desirability for perfect free trade as regards cattle between one part of England and the other, 2265. 2364——Statement that it is proposed to continue the prohibition on the import of cattle into Australia until the year 1880; opinion that if this country were in the meantime declared free from disease, the trade to Australia would be resumed, 2272. 2280. 2285–2288.

Disapproval of permitting in all cases the movement of animals from an infected district with a pass from a qualified inspector; discretion necessary in the local authority, 2299–2302——Recommendation that the Government should take the question of restriction entirely into their own hands and supersede the local authorities; expediency of the cost of inspection throughout the country being borne by Imperial instead of local funds, 2302. 2430–2437.

Willingness of witness and of the farmers generally to submit to severe restrictions in order to stamp out pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease, 2314. 2340. 2363. 2411-2413. 2418, 2419. 2421, 2422. 2462——Expediency of prohibiting the importation into this country of live stock, even if there were no such disease as cattle plague; grounds for this opinion, 2322. 2326. 2335. 2361, 2362. 2376–2380. 2386–2391. 2424, 2425.

Anticipated

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Booth, Thomas Christopher. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued*

Anticipated outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease averted by means of the existing restrictions in consequence of the cattle plague; belief that it would be quite possible to stamp out this disease in England, 2335-2337. 2340. 2345, 2346. 2350-2356. 2367——Monetary loss by witness from foot-and-mouth disease to the extent of 30,000 *l.* or 40,000 *l.*, 2341, 2342.

Increase of cattle in Ireland in the last twenty-five years to the extent of about four times its value, 2344——Decided opinion that if we were free from disease we could produce a great deal more meat than we do, 2347–2349 ——Further evidence respecting the restrictions for the suppression of the cattle plague in England; recommendation that importation be totally prohibited, and failing this, that importation be prohibited from any country in which there exists any disease whatever, 2350–2355. 2361. 2376–2379. 2428-2430. 2459-2461.

Considerable freedom of this country from foot-and-mouth disease at the present time, 2357-2460——Desirability of treating Ireland, as regards movement of cattle, exactly the same as England; belief that foot-and-mouth disease is not generated in Ireland, 2365, 2366——Inexpediency of stamping out foot-and-mouth disease by slaughter; opinion that the stoppage of movement in infected districts would be sufficient, 2367–2375. 2442–2446——Belief that pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease are foreign diseases, notwithstanding that they may, to a certain extent, have become acclimatised in England, 2381-2385. 2420.

Unsatisfactory character of the inspection of foreign animals; probability that a larger number of diseased animals escape detection than those that are discovered, 2392–2400 ——Suggestions as to the regulations for stamping out foot-and-mouth disease, 2401–2408——Argument that pleuro-pneumonia should come under the same regulations as foot-and-mouth disease or cattle plague, 2409, 2410. 2414-2417.

Further statement that cattle plague, pneumonia, and foot-and-mouth disease undoubtedly came to this country from the Continent, and that if importation was strictly prohibited from infected countries we should get rid of these diseases eventually, 2438–2441——Advantageous effect upon the price of meat of the total prohibition of live cattle from infected countries, 2449-2454——Diseases in this country which induce foreign countries to prohibit the importation of our cattle, 2455-2458.

Breconshire. Prevalence of much foot-and-mouth disease in Breconshire, introduced by Irish cattle, *Sir C. A. Wood* 7412. 7474-7476.

Breeding Stock. See *Calves. Cows. Home Breeding. Store Cattle.*

Bristol. Explanation that Bristol is a prohibited port as regards import of live cattle from the Continent, *Whitwell* 1942.

Statement as to the Government inspectors at Bristol having nothing to do with sheep or pigs from Ireland, whilst the local inspector does not inspect on landing, and is paid only by half the fines when disease is detected in the market, *Lord Fitzhardinge* 5263–5268. 5289-5293——Bad condition of some sheep and pigs recently landed at Bristol from Ireland, *ib.* 5294, 5295. 5322-5326.

Recent landing of a large quantity of cattle, sheep, and pigs at Bristol, the latter having been affected with foot-and-mouth disease, and all having been driven away together, *Peters* 5346-5358. 5363-5381——Presence of two Government inspectors on the foregoing occasion; statement as to these having merely the power of reporting to the local authorities, *ib.* 5353, 5354. 5366-5371. 5380, 5381. 5390-5403——Recent landing of sheep suffering severely from foot-and-mouth disease, *ib.* 5381–5383.

Considerable improvement in the arrangements at Bristol for the landing of animals from the Irish boats, and for their subsequent removal or distribution, *Brown* 9955–9957 ——Practice at Bristol as regards diseased pigs from Ireland being given in charge of a policeman for slaughter, *ib.* 9947–9950.

Further particulars as to the present process of inspection at Bristol; its insufficiency as a protection against the import of disease, *Brown* 9965–9967. 10111, 10112.

See also *Ireland, and Irish Cattle.*

Brown, Professor George Thomas. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is the professional officer of the Veterinary Department of the Privy Council Office, 1——Summary of the measures adopted by the department relative to the cattle plague since the outbreaks in 1865, 1866, and 1867; reference more especially to the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, passed in 1869; 2. 8——Pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease defined as contagious diseases for the first time in the Act of 1869; 2.

Enumeration in this Act of countries, termed "scheduled countries," from which animals could only be imported for the purpose of slaughter; certain countries included in the schedule under this Act, 3-8. 25-32——Grounds for the withdrawal of Schleswig-Holstein from the schedule in 1872; this arrangement made on account of the introduction

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Brown, Professor George Thomas. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

duction of cattle plague from Germany into England by means of Russian cattle, 8–12. 27–32.

Information as the introduction of cattle plague into England in 1869 and 1872, and the circumstances which caused it to spread in the latter year; preventive measures taken, and effect thereof, 10–17——Statement as to the disease having been introduced in 1869, 1872, and 1877, without official information from the country whence the cattle were imported, 10–13——Explanation of the term "Mediate Contagion;" great difficulty experienced by the authorities in preventing the extnseion of disease by this means, especially as regards cattle plague, 14, 15. 41–48.

Opinion that the authorities should have power, as in Germany, to slaughter in any case in which they may be advised that it is necessary; conviction that if they had had this power in 1872, the disease in East Yorkshire would have been stamped out at the time it appeared, 14–19. 142——Prohibition of the importation of cattle from Russia before the outbreak at Hull, in consequence of information as to the existence of cattle plague in that country, 20–23.

Statement that the danger of introducing cattle plague by means of sheep is so slight, it is not necessary to insist upon their slaughter at the landing places, 26——Establishment of regulations for the purpose of procuring early information as to outbreaks of cattle plague on the Continent; inefficiency of this information in every case, 33–35. 55–64. 269.

Precautions taken at landing places as to separating the defined from the undefined parts of the port; unfavourable opinion as to some of the arrangements at the ports, 36–40——Great defects in the present system in regard to the want of control over the landing of cattle; absence of means for stopping the movement of vessels or persons on board vessels, 41–43.

Non-existence of the danger of mediate contagion as regards pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease; illustration in support of this theory, 43–48——Opinion that the present system of inspection is sufficient to guard against foot-and-mouth disease, by reason of the short period of incubation; belief that the inspection is conscientiously performed, 49, 50——Occasional failure of detection of foot-and-mouth disease in the case of swine, inasmuch as they no not show the disease so markedly as other animals, and are more difficult to examine, 49, 50.

Statement that the incubation period of cattle plague varies from four to seven days, 51——Impossibility, by any system of quarantine or inspection, to guard against pleuro-pneumonia on account of the long period which elapses before development, 52–54.

Explanations in detail relative to the recent outbreak of cattle plague, the origin thereof, its spread, and the remedial meaaures adopted, 55 *et seq.*——Information with reference more especially to the cattle brought to Deptford in the present year in the "Castor," all of them having been affected with cattle plague; action taken at Deptford in regard to these cattle, 62–89——Absence of any official notification as to an outbreak in Germany upon the occasion of the arrival of the "Castor" from Hamburg, 64–71——Precautions taken at Hull as regards a similar cargo of diseased cattle brought over in the "Hansa," 87.

Orders and circulars issued from the veterinary department immediatey upon the discovery of the cattle plague in London and Hull; prohibition of fairs and markets in the East Riding under an Order of the Privy Council, 88. 117–125. 169–172——Appearance of the cattle plague in widely different quarters, subsequent to its discovery at Deptford, 98–102. 106, 107. 112–114. 116. 119–122. 126–128. 132–142. 197–205. 211–228——Great danger of propogating disease by the habitual purchase of hay and straw from the cattle ships by the dairymen in Hull; statement that the outbreak in Hull was solely in the dairies, 126–131.

Considerable difficulty experienced by local authorities in enforcing the Order as to the disinfection of persons who have been in connection with diseased animals; inability of the local authorities to carry out these and like arrangements with the present limited staff, 143–153——Suggested improvements in the existing state of things, especially having reference to the duties of the local authorities; admission that these sugestions would entail a large increase in the present staff, 154. 166–168.

Communication of cattle plague by particles of dead animals, and also by meat which has been affected by the disease; impossibility under certain conditions of detecting meat which comes from a diseased animal, 154–158. 180–185——Absolute necessity for the destruction of the manure of diseased animals; recommendation that it be rendered harmless by mixing it with its own weight of quick lime, 159–165.

Desirability of the central authority having the appointment of all inspectors throughout the country, 168——Instructions given to the inspectors in the London district in regard to their visits to dairies; few instances in which objections were made by the owners to these visits, 172–179. 186–191——Directions given to the inspector to prevent any persons

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Brown, Professor George Thomas. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

sons leaving infected premises unless they submit to a process of disinfection; instance of a person who refused to submit to this process, and who is being prosecuted by the Treasury, 173–177.

Statement that in some particulars the instructions given to the inspectors were more stringent than were necessary, in order to make sure of preventing the spread of the disease, 178, 179——Description of the meat of animals that have been slaughtered when the disease has been very far advanced, 180–183——Reference to the danger of spreading the disease by people moving about in their several trades connected with cattle, 211–222.

Information respecting a cattle disease in the Isle of Man in 1865, which eventually proved to be a non-contagious affection, 228–232——Statement that a post-mortem examination is not always infallible in determining the existence of disease; difference of opinion between witness and Mr. Duguid upon this point, 233–236——Course pursued by Mr. Duguid in the Hull outbreak; slaughter of the whole herd upon his decision formed in a single case, 237–243.

Possibility of an outbreak of cattle plague occurring six weeks after a place has been declared free, without any palpable evidence of communication being obtainable, 241——Total inability to trace the cause of the outbreak in Lincolnshire, either by the introduction of animals or by people who had been in contact with the Hull infected district, 244–254——Firm conviction of witness that he has in several past cases slaughtered animals unnecessarily upon such evidence as he would not now be satisfied with, 258–268.

Detailed information respecting the progress of the cattle plague in Germany; sheep attacked by the plague at Emden, 269–278——Extensive attacks of the disease in sheep in England; remarkable fact that it has never been introduced into this country by sheep, 277, 278——Absence of doubt that the disease has been stamped out in Germany by means of severe regulations; the regulations in Germany are, in fact, far more severe than would be tolerated in this country, 279–284. 290——Entire stoppage of movement throughout Germany; adoption, also, of a system of declaring a place infected for twenty kilometres round the seat of the disease, 283, 284——Restrictions in Germany as to the movement of people out of the infected circles, 285–290.

Grounds for believing that all the diseases in question have been introduced into England from the Continent, 291–300——Decided opinion that slaughter at the place of landing has not been a sufficient protection against cattle plague, in consequence of the facility at the same time for mediate contagion, 301, 302——Belief that the prevalence of pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease in this country has nothing to do with its introduction from abroad, 303–308——Suggestions for the prevention of the introduction of those diseases into England, 309–313. 335–344.

Argument that the only way of dealing with cattle plague is to prohibit the importation of live cattle from those countries where cattle plague has been certified to exist; necessity, also, of prohibiting meat and all animal products which might be likely to convey the disease, 314–344——Expediency of permitting the introduction of certain animal products on account of the exigencies of important trades in this country, 346, 347.

Examination as regards the importation into England of dead meat; opinion that meat can be so brought at any season of the year, 348–375. 385——Large quantities of meat condemned in hot weather as unfit for food, 358——Average price of meat in American towns about half that in England, 363, 364.

Grounds for the opinion that meat could not be sent to England from the Continent at the same low price as from America, 365–371——Belief that from Germany we should get a very small proportion of dead meat as compared with the quantity of meat represented by live cattle, 375–379——Expediency of permitting sheep and swine to come from Germany without further restrictions than exist at present; the introduction of cattle plague has not been traced to these animals, 380–384.

[Second Examination.]—Additional information respecting the outbreak at Hull, which it is believed was not an instance of cattle plague, 501–503. 798–801. 879, 880——Statement that several recent cases in the metropolis have turned out not to be cattle plague, 504——Explanation that the measures now in force are those contained in the Order in Council of 16th April, the Privy Council taking the action of the local authority from that date, 505——Three Orders passed on the 27th April with a view to preventing the spread of cattle plague from the metropolis, 505, 506.

Fallacy of the statement that the continued importation of foreign animals is the cause of the introduction of pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease, 507, 508——Proposal in reference to cattle plague (which is undoubtedly introduced by live animals from abroad), that the importation from Germany and Belgium should be unconditionally

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Brown, Professor George Thomas. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

ally prohibited; belief that the loss to this country would be compensated by the amount of dead meat imported, 509-513.

Necessity, in the case of pleuro-pnemomia and foot-and-mouth disease, of accompanying the prohibition of importation of foreign stock with stringent regulations at home; as long as free movement in this country continues it will be impossible to get rid of these diseases, 513-516. 545-548. 558——Introduction of 30,000 animals affected with foot-and-mouth disease in the years 1875 and 1876; 517-520——Pleuro-pneumonia more frequently introduced than foot-and-mouth disease, on account of the impossibility of the disease being detected in the stage of incubation, 517-522.

Further suggestions as to the means to be adopted for stamping out both pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease; necessity for giving larger and more elastic powers to the Privy Council, 523-526. 530-548. 552-555. 650. 785-791——Advantage of employing the police throughout the country as inspectors under the local authority, 524-526——Opinion that the increased cost caused by these proposals would be insignificant as compared with the amount of loss which is sustained by the ravages of contagious disease, 527-529. 559-561.

Expediency of preventing the landing of "Surplus Ships' Stores," as was recommended by the Committee of 1873; 530-533——Desirability of enforcing obedience to the proposed regulations by means of severe penalties in the Act in the case of infringement, 538, 539——Conviction that foreign store stock, with very few exceptions, are not required in England at all; considerable restrictions necessary in the case of admitting any dairy or store stock whatever, 540-544. 727-731.

Statement that pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease will inevitably continue in this country quite irrespective of the importation of fresh animals from abroad, 548. 555——Decided opinion that the cowsheds in all the large towns are the chief centres of contagious disease, chiefly pleuro-pneumonia; difficulty in abolishing these centres of infection, 549-553.

Approval of slaughtering without hesitation all animals that show any evidence of pleuro-pneumonia, 554——Advocacy of inoculation in the case of animals that show no sign of the disease, but have been in association with those that have had it, 554——Proposal as to the prohibition of import into Ireland, 556, 557. 861——Great importance of developing the dead meat trade; impossibillty of dealing effectively with contagious diseases, unless this trade very largely takes the place of traffic in live animals, 562-565.

Further information respecting the position held by witness in the Veterinary Department, 567, 568——Recommendations made by the Committee of 1873, and extent to which carried out; non-adoption of the recommendation that the regulations in Great Britain and in Ireland should be similar, 569-573. 581-595. 616-628——Certain recommendations of the Committee which could only have been carried out by means of an Act of Parliament, 571-573.

Statement that the recent outbreak of cattle plague has undoubtedly confirmed the opinion of witness that there should be power to order the slaughter of animals; grounds for the belief that if the authorities had had this power the disease might have been extinguished in less than a month, 574-579. 671-679——Opinion that the time during which the pleuro-pneumonia rules should be applied to premises in which the disease has been discovered should be extended from thirty days to two months; necessity for an Act of Parliament to make this change, 589-593.

Orders issued by the Privy Council in relation to the foot-and-mouth disease to the effect that the action should be the same all through the country, 595-606——Power for the local authority to pay compensation in the case of pleuro-pneumonia to the extent of three-fourths of the value of the animal, 607-609——Compensation in the case of cattle plague to the extent of one-half the value of diseased animals, and three-fourths of the value of animals which have been herded with them but are not actually diseased, 610-615——Great disadvantage that the regulations with regard to the stoppage of disease are varying or permissive, 616, 617.

Expediency of giving to the local authorities the power of entry into premises where the disease is suspected to exist, 619, 620——Steps taken by the Irish Government to inspect animals at Irish ports, 625——Revocation of the Orders made in furtherance of the recommendation of the Committee of 1873 in regard to foot-and-mouth disease, 629——Impression that the information respecting the outbreak of cattle plague in 1872 was given by one of the importers of the diseased animals; manner in which the plague was stamped out in that year, 630-636.

Statement that notwithstanding forty-eight carcases were washed ashore on the Lincolnshire coast in 1872 there was no disease in consequence, 637——Circumstances under which the cattle plague came to us from the Continent in 1872; belief that in this case the movement of Russian troops had no influence upon the outbreak, 638-648——Remarkable

Brown, Professor George Thomas. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

——Remarkable fact that the cattle plague does not affect Russian cattle in the same serious way that it affects English cattle, 649.

Further expression of opinion that the stockowners in England would not comply with the stringent regulations necessary to get rid of foot-and-mouth disease, 651–665——Readiness with which foot-and-mouth disease could be stamped out if it were the only disease we had to deal with, 656–659—— Difficulty in stamping out pleuro-pnemonia, on account of the impossibility of detecting it in its earliest stages, 666-670.

Impossibility of making a satisfactory computation of the proportion that the import of cattle bears to the consumption in England; belief that the introduction of dead meat does not in any way affect the calculation, 680–692——Absence of definite information regarding the importation of dead meat into England; advantage of a dead meat trade as diminishing the risk of conveying disease, 693–698. 864–850.

Additional recommendations as to the means to be adopted for preventing the introduction of cattle plague into England; necessity for entirely shutting out cattle, but not sheep, from Germany, 699–714. 722–724. 834–845. 853–856. 862–867——Existing regulations for the interchange of information with Germany respecting cattle plague, 715–721——Desirability, from a sanitary point of view, of sending all imported cattle to Deptford, or of establishing arrangements for slaughtering at Thames Haven, 725, 726 ——Approval of dealing with fat stock from Spain, Portugal, and Denmark, in the same manner as with animals in this country, 732–735.

Order in force at present that if one animal in a foreign cargo is found affected with foot-and-mouth disease, the whole of such cargo shall be slaughtered, 736–742——Further information as to the advantage of international engagements in regard to importation of cattle, 743–752—— Explanation with regard to the limitation of ports where foreign animals are allowed to be landed, as recommended by the Committee of 1873; 753–762 ——Expediency of adopting uniformity of action by means of Government inspection, 763–770. 802.

Desirability for the authorities being empowered to make regulations for preventing the conveyance of disease by mediate contagion in the event of slaughter at the port of debarkation, 775, 776——Considerable falling off in the supply of foreign meat to the Metropolitan Market, 779–784——Impossibility of establishing a practical system of quarantine, 792–797—— Greater danger of conveying cattle disease than pleuro-pneumonia by mediate contagion, 803–808.

Additional information regarding the origin of the several cattle diseases in this country, 811–820. 851, 852——Necessity for severe measures if it be determined to eradicate these diseases, 820–826 ——Successful result of the late severe restrictions as regards cattle plague; direct loss of 10,000*l.* or 12,000*l.*; 827–833——One-third of 1,000,000 of cattle destroyed by the last great outbreak, 857–860——Difficulty in instituting any system of inspection at the port of embarkation, 868–878.

[Third Examination.]—Further expression of opinion that the recent case of disease in London was not cattle plague, 881–883——Circumstances respecting the very mild outbreak which occurred in Ireland in 1866; non-spreading of the disease in that country due to the prompt and energetic action of the Irish Government, 884–888—— Conclusion further expressed as to the absolute necessity of prohibiting the importation of cattle from those countries in which cattle plague exists, 889, 890. 976–978. 1022. 1068–1070.

Information relative to the total amount of losses during the outbreak from 1865 to 1867, and the cost of dealing with the outbreak; belief that a large amount of these losses would have been saved if we had adopted the continental system of stamping out the disease instead of trying experiments as to treatment, 891–895. 903–905.–989–994 ——Probable increase in the price of meat which would result from the stoppage of the importation of live stock, 896, 897——Absence of any scarcity of milk notwithstanding the prevalence of fatal diseases among dairy cows, 906–912.

Additional statement that foot-and-mouth disease is not generally conveyed by means of mediate contagion, and that it is less infectious than cattle plague; the prevalence of this disease throughout the country is principally owing to the indiscriminate movement of diseased and infected animals, 913–921——Argument that the trade in dead meat, as in all other articles of commerce, will find its own level, and be adopted where it pays; prospect of increase in the American trade if live cattle be excluded, 922–926 979–983. 999–1005.

Questionable advantage in the system of inspection at the ports as carried out at present; greater importance of detecting the disease at its centre of origin by means of inspectors, and preventing the movement of diseased animals from those centres, 927–933. 940–942——Further explanation with reference to the introduction of diseased animals on board the "Castor" from Hamburg, 934–939. 1022—— Expediency of a

Brown, Professor George Thomas. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

short Act of Parliament in lieu of the present Act, giving the Privy Council power to make the necessary regulations in the various districts, 943, 944.

Decided opinion that pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease are naturalised in this country, and that they would continue without the aid of foreign supply, 945, 946 ——Non-existence of the cattle plague in this country, unless when introduced from Germany and Russia, 947, 948. 1023——Undoubted possibility of conveying cattle plague by means of dead meat, but in a slighter degree than by the living animal; character of the supervision exercised over the meat sent into the market from animals which have had the disease in its earlier stage, 949-955——Disease not communicable by means of the milk of an animal in which disease was incubating, 956.

Further observations in support of giving the Privy Council power to slaughter animals within a certain radius, which, though not in contact with diseased animals, have nevertheless been exposed to infection, 957-962. 1078, 1079——Expediency of full compensation, chiefly with the object of inducing owners to give notice of disease; possibility, in the event of increasing the compensation, of the Privy Council taking more stringent measures to restrict the movement of animals, 963, 964. 973, 974——Importance attached to disisfection of the manure of diseased animals, 965——Movement of animals suffering from foot-and-mouth disease permitted under certain circumstances under an Order of the Privy Council, 966——Large extent to which the dead meat trade in London has grown since it was first established, 967-972.

Further expression of opinion that in the event of a fresh outbreak of cattle plague, the Privy Council should be empowered to supersede the local authorities in all cases; though in such case the cost would be greater, it would be compensated by the saving in the number of cattle, 984-988——Belief that the Texan cattle disease could not be imported by means of dead meat, 995-998——Decided belief that if the importation of dead meat as well as live cattle were prohibited from affected countries there would be an undiminished supply from America, 999. 1073-1077.

Additional explanation relative to the outbreak at Hull and the subsequent arrangements which have been adopted at that port; numbers of the annual import of foreign cattle into Hull during the year 1876; 1006-1021. 1024-1026. 1084-1093. 1101, 1102 ——Belief that the proposed restrictions in regard to vessels and crews would probably enhance freights, but would not drive vessels out of the cattle trade altogether, 1027-1030——Expectation that vessels would be provided for cattle exclusively, 1030, 1031 ——Examination upon the question whether the poor would not suffer from the loss of offal through the cattle being slaughtered at the port of debarkation or at the port of shipment, 1032-1035. 1094-1100. 1103, 1104.

Belief that in future there will be no serious loss from cattle plague on account of the efficient precautions to be adopted, 1036-1038——Further consideration of the recommendations made by the Committee of 1873; those which required legislation referred principally to cattle plague and pleuro-pneumonia, 1040-1060——Reasons for not carrying out the recommendation of the Committee with regard to glanders; difficulty which would arise in compensating for the slaughter of horses affected with glanders, 1049, 1050.

Enumeration of the ports which have been closed, and those which have been left open for the debarkation of cattle, 1053-1056——Increased inspection since 1874 of animals imported from Ireland, 1061. 1064-1067——Similar treatment of Irish cattle as of English in regard to compulsory slaughter for pleuro-pneumonia, 1061-1067.

Unimportant effect, at present, of the stoppage of the German trade, as during this period of the year very few German cattle are imported, 1071, 1072——Opinion that the small risk of introducing the Texan cattle disease into England would not be sufficient reason for stopping the importation of live cattle from America, 1080-1083——Explanation that witness contemplates the landing of cattle from Schleswig-Holstein at Hull for slaughter, 1099-1100.

[Fourth Examination.]—There is no case of cattle plague now in this country (6th July 1877), 9873——Important effect of the cattle plague regulations and restrictions in diminishing the amount of foot-and-mouth disease throughout the country; particulars hereon, 9874-9885——Conviction of witness that this disease will increase when the regulations now in force over the country, and the cordon round the metropolis, are removed, 9883.

Further conviction that, in order to eradicate foot-and-mouth disease from England, the necessary restrictions must continue in force for a considerable time, 9886-9890——Conclusion, also, that a prohibition of import would not suffice for the disappearance of the disease, unless accompanied by stringent precautions at home, 9890-9894.

Statement to the effect that pleuro-pneumonia has not been diminished by the restrictions in force in reference to cattle plague, 9895, 9896——Doubt as to any practicable means of extirpating pleuro-pneumonia in six months, 9897. 9901, 9902——Effect of the restrictions enforced in Holland, as regards the suppression of pleuro-pneumonia, 9897-

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Brown, Professor George Thomas. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

9901——Very severe restrictions necessary in order to stamp out this disease throughout the country; belief that farmers would not willingly undergo the great inconvenience involved, 9901-9905.

Further expression of the opinion that protection can best be secured against cattle plague by prohibiting the import of cattle from Germany and Belgium, and also from France, unless she adopts the required precautions for guarding her frontier, 9906, 9907.

Much larger import of diseased animals but for the system of inspection at the port of arrival, 9908——Explanation in reference to a complaint by Mr. Robinson that a cargo of cattle had been passed at Harwich, in March 1874, before the twelve hours' daylight detention had expired, 9908-9915——Explanation also as regards a statement by Mr. Robinson that some cattle landed at Harwich, in October 1874, had been passed after sunset, 9916, 9917.

Information as to the results of an official inquiry made in consequence of a complaint that the inspector at Harwich did not stop animals which would be stopped in London; the same practice was in reality pursued at both ports, 9918-9925——Grounds for the conclusion that it would be very unwise for the Privy Council to appoint inspectors at the port of embarkation abroad, 9926-9929.

Security to be obtained by having special cattle ships, coming to particular ports, and by carefully disinfecting the vessels and the men in charge of the cattle, 9930-9932——Further security by a longer detention of animals before they are landed, 9932, 9933——Explanation of the delay before the Privy Council interfered with the local authorities on the last outbreak of cattle plague, 9934-9937. 10164-10166.

Statement to the effect that the Government inspectors at ports, such as Bristol, where Irish cattle are landed, are empowered merely to report disease to the local authority, and to the Privy Council, without compelling immediate slaughter of the diseased animals, 9938-9954——Practice, at Bristol, in regard to diseased pigs from Ireland being given in charge of a policeman for slaughter, 9947-9950——Considerable improvement in the arrangements at Bristol for the landing of animals from the Irish boats, and for their subsequent removal or distribution, 9955-9957.

Fairly satisfactory arrangements on board the Irish boats which come to Bristol; good condition in which some recent cargoes have arrived, whilst there was only death one on the voyage, 9957-9959. 10112. 10132——Improvement if vessels were used and fitted for cattle exclusively; difficulty on the score of expense, 9960-9964——Particulars as to the present process of inspection at Bristol; its insufficiency as a protection against the import of disease, 9965-9967. 10111-10112.

Want of increased powers in the Privy Council for dealing with inclosed spaces, or railway pens, where animals are placed before removal by rail; that is, on the score, more especially, of disinfection, and of watering the animals, 9968-9975. 10113-10117——Expediency of the ports or places of landing for Irish cattle being defined, so that inspection may not be evaded, 9976-9978.

Importance of the regulations of the Privy Council being applicable to the United Kingdom, so that Ireland and Scotland, as well as England, may be bound by them, 9978-9983——Prohibition by the Privy Council of the acceptance by their inspectors of any portion of the fines on conviction, 9984-9985.

Further argument that the severe home restrictions required for stamping out pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease would not be submitted to by farmers without very strong opposition, 9986-9988. 10070-10074. 10081, 10082——Diminution of foot-and-mouth disease by means of local restrictions, though when the disease is prevalent over the whole country, more extensive and stringent regulations are necessary, 9989, 9990——Importance of the Privy Council having full powers, through their inspectors, to act at once in requiring the slaughter of animals, without referring the matter to the local authority, or the local inspectors; case in point, 9991-9996.

Grounds for the conclusion that certain statistics, as to the total loss of cattle in this country from disease, are quite unreliable; estimate of 1½ per cent. as the total annual deaths from diseases of all kinds, 9997-10003. 10098. 10142-10149——Frequent presence of foot-and-mouth disease in Islington market, and in fairs and markets generally, 10004-10006——Difficulty in ensuring the subsequent slaughter of animals sold at Islington, although they might be branded for slaughter, 10007-10009.

Recent instances of suspected lung disease in some American cattle landed at Southampton; insufficient ground for such suspicion, 10010, 10011——Conclusion further expressed as to the necessity of excluding cattle from Germany and Belgium, in reference to cattle plague, 10012, 10013. 10028——Further argument also that, in order to extirpate pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease, it is essential to slaughter all foreign cattle, sheep, and pigs at the port of debarkation, 10016-10019. 10045.

Belief as to the facility of carrying on a permanent dead-meat trade, all foreign cattle being slaughtered at the ports, 10018-10021. 10039, 10040——Notice required to be

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Brown, Professor George Thomas. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

given before applying restrictions as to slaughtering at the ports generally; expediency of this being done by Act, rather than by Order in Council, 10020, 10021. 10040, 10041. 10204, 10205——Grounds for the opinion that dead meat, as well as live animals, should be excluded from any country where there is cattle plague, 10022–10024.

Better check, doubtless, as regards cattle plague, if there were immediate and direct telegraphic communication from any locality abroad where it may be detected, 10025–10028——Inaccuracy of a certain statement as to the Privy Council having been remiss in taking action in the case of the "Castor," 10025, 10026——Grounds for the conclusion that offal may be imported from the Continent in good condition, 10029–10033.

Effect of the total prohibition of the import of live stock in increasing the price of meat; that is, until arrangements were made for a dead meat trade, in conjunction with slaughtering, at the ports, 10034. 10037–10040——Belief that the price of meat is never likely to fall to 5*d.* or 6*d.* per pound, as a result of the entire exclusion of foreign cattle, 13034–10036——Denial given by salesmen to a statement as to their charging a different commission for foreign and English cattle, 10042, 10043.

Opinion that absolute security against the introduction of disease cannot be obtained by any precautions, however strict, 10045——Approval of the present facilities of import from the Channel Islands, the animals being detained for some time at the landing-place, 10045–10049. 10105, 10106. 10258. 10260——Facility to be given also to the import of American and Canadian cattle, so long as there is no disease in those countries, 10045–10047. 10258.

Reference to the cessation of the official returns of foot-and-mouth disease as having been due solely to the expense involved, 10050, 10051——Exception taken to a suggestion for the appointment of a staff of travelling inspectors, 10053, 10054——Import of disease from Belgium and Germany at times when it was not reported as existing in those countries, 10054.

Explanation that witness does not propose slaughtering at the port of debarkation, in reference to foot-and-mouth disease, unless certain stringent measures be also enforced as regards movement of cattle at home, and the holding of fairs and markets, 10056–10058. 10080. 10101, 10102. 10248, 10249——Expediency also of certain restrictions as to the slaughtering of home cattle, in contact with others, having foot-and-mouth disease, 10059–10063——Importance attached to the cordon round London; question as to the relaxations desirable, 10064–10066. 10107–10110.

Summary of the home restrictions desirable in reference to pleuro-pneumonia, in conjunction with a system of slaughtering at the ports, 10067–10069. 10101, 10102——Suggestions for a trial of inoculation as a preventive in cases of pleuro-pneumonia; difficulty at present in forming conclusions as to the success of this treatment, 10067. 10122–10126——Conclusion as to the serious interference with trade by a system of quarantine of Dutch cows, 10075–10079. 10198.

Belief further expressed that both pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease are originated only by infection, 10083, 10084——More fatal results from pleuro-pneumonia, though foot-and-mouth disease is more prevalent, 10085, 10086——Opinion that if the necessary restrictions were not thwarted by the farmers, foot-and-mouth disease might be obliterated in twelve months, 10087–10092. 10229——Witness repeats that the farmers would probably throw great difficulties in the way of severe restrictions; instance in Lincolnshire, 10091. 10096, 10097. 10103, 10104——Necessary lapse of some years before the country could be pronounced free from pleuro-pneumonia; experience of Holland to this effect, 10093. 10267–10271.

Inadequacy of inspection as a means of preventing the import of diseased animals, 10094, 10095——Very rare import of foreign stock into Ireland, the disease in that country being introduced by English stock, 10118–10121. 10242–10244——Further argument that Ireland should be treated as part of the United Kingdom, and not as a foreign country, 10127, 10128. 10140, 10141——Amended system of inspection desirable as regards railway-borne cattle from Scotland, 10120–10122.

Comparatively small number of sheep and swine imported from Ireland with foot-and-mouth disease, whilst the Irish cattle are now free from the disease, 10133–10136——Beneficial effect of the exclusion of dairy sheds from large towns, though this could hardly be effected in London, on account of the opposition that would arise, 10137–10139.

Examination in further support of the proposal that the central authority should have power to require their regulations being carried out by the local authorities, 10150–10184——Frequent instances of negligence on the part of local authorities to carry out the necessary regulations; denial that the Privy Council is equally open to this charge, 10152–10181. 10220, 10221——Admission as to the entire efficiency of local action at Birmingham, 10153–10170——Explanation that witness does not propose to supersede the local authorities, or to deprive them of the power of appointing inspectors, 10182–10185.

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Brown, Professor George Thomas. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

Information as to the action of the Privy Council in reference to the cleansing of cattle trucks by the railway companies; obstacles thereto, 10186–10195——Approval of additional power in the local authorities as to the control of cow-sheds, 10196——Difficulty as to the local authorities being empowered to inspect premises in reference to glanders or farcy, 10197.

Opinion that the dairies can be well supplied by cows bred at home, if the import of Dutch cows be prohibited, except for slaughter, 10198–10203——Belief as to the facility of arranging for slaughtering at the port of Newcastle, and for carrying on a dead meat trade with the adjacent districts, 10206–10217——Opinion that, in course of time, the price of meat would be diminished, rather than increased, by prohibition upon the import of live stock, 10218, 10219. 10228.

Expediency of sufficient time for disinfection before a cattle ship from Ireland takes a return cargo of cattle, 10222, 10223 ——Belief that there is not now any foot-and-mouth disease in the United States, 10224–10226——Great boon to the consumer in this country, as well as to the former, by an eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, 10227–10228.

Explanation that, whilst advocating compulsory slaughter at the port, witness would admit store cattle from countries where no disease exists, provided such cattle be subjected to careful restrictions, 10230–10232. 10256, 10257 —— Limitation to be placed on the number of ports, unless proper slaughtering arrangements be made, 10233, 10234 —— Probability of a better class of animals being sent from abroad if slaughter on arrival be compulsory; effect upon the price of meat to the lower classes, 10235–10241. 10245–10247.

Necessity not only of ample slaughtering accommodation at the ports, but of approved arrangements for cooling the carcases, as in America, 10250–10255——Objection to import from Spain, unless the cattle be slaughtered on arrival, 10259——Doubt as to foot-and-mouth disease having died out naturally in some countries where restrictions have not been enforced, 10261–10263.

Belief as to the number of dairy cows in London having diminished in recent years, 10264–10266——Proposed limitation of home restrictions to those localities in which disease exists; if disease were general, the restrictions should be applied to the whole country at the same time, 10272–10274——Relative prevalence of pleuro-pneumonia and of foot-and-mouth disease in May 1877; 10274, 10275. 10281.

Further statement as to the Privy Council not having attempted to enforce the powers of their inspectors as regards interference with the local authority; expediency of means being provided for the enforcement of such powers by the central department, 10276–10280.

[Fifth Examination.]—Particulars in connection with a recent outbreak of cattle plague (detected on the 14th July) in Bethnal Green, within less than half a mile of previous outbreaks on 17th May and 17th March; inquiries made and action taken by the Privy Council, but without being able yet to trace the origin of the outbreak, 10282–10295. 10300–10311. 10342–10378.

Considerable difficulty in some cases as to the inspectors' entry upon premises; instructions issued to them in consequence, 10292–10297 —— Unsatisfactory character of the present inspection of dairy sheds; information proposed to be obtained in future by means of the police, 10298, 10299. 10316. 10318.

Belief that in the recent case of cattle plague the owner did not intend to give information; intention of prosecuting him for not giving notice, 10300-——Advantage if compensation were not given where information is withheld by the owner, 10300 ——Way in which the recent outbreak in Bethnal Green was discovered, 10300, 10301——Effectual steps taken for stamping out the disease, and for preventing infection, 10302.

Further consideration of the question as to the origin of the recent outbreak; difficulties in the way of a definite conclusion on the subject, 10303–10311. 10342–10378. 10462, 10463——Probability that the disease was introduced into the dairy shed by a cow brought in by a man named Plummer, 10305–10311. 10355–10360. 10378. 10462.

Information as to the mode in which cows are now supplied to the London dairy sheds and are removed from one shed to another; peculiar facilities for the spread of disease under this system, 10312–10315——Insufficiency of the compensation as an inducement to owners to give notice of disease; that is, on account of the great interruption of business necessarily entailed by the restrictions, 10315. 10379–10381. 10423——Conclusion as to the necessity of applying more stringent regulations, and an improved inspection, to the London dairy sheds, 10316–10318.

Explanation in connection with two Orders issued by the Privy Council since the last outbreak of cattle plague in Bethnal Green; particulars more especially as to the establishment of an "infected area" by the Order now in force, and as to the advantages of this mode of restricting movement, 10319–10329——Prohibition of movement from the

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Brown, Professor George Thomas. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

north of the metropolis to any places south of the Thames, 10325, 10326——Question considered whether the Privy Council has power to establish "infected areas" throughout the country, as well as in the metropolis; expediency of amended and enlarged powers in the matter, 10330–10341. 10401–10403.

Grounds for the conclusion that cattle plague has existed for the last few months in certain dairies in London, though it has not been known to exist; hence the recent outbreak, 10347–10352. 10390. 10404–10411. 10421, 10422——Expediency of arrangements for keeping cats out of slaughter-houses, and out of contact with diseased carcases, 10370–10372. 10399, 10400——Belief that by proper precautions an effectual and constant inspection may be applied to the London dairies, without danger of disease being conveyed by means of the inspectors from one dairy to another, 10382–10389.

Frequent evasion of the regulations as to movement of cows in the metropolis under license, 10391. 10397. 10453——Several instances of unlicensed dairies; amendment desirable on this score, 10392, 10393. 10429–10431——Power of entry of sanitary officers into dairies; these officers are of little use in the detection of disease, 10394–10396——Difficulties in the way of a registration of the cows in dairies, as a check upon movement, 10397, 10398.

Conviction of witness that the last outbreak of cattle plague did not arise spontaneously; nor was it directly imported, 10404–10413. 10421, 10422——Doubt as to the advantage of a power to examine on oath, in order to better ascertain the origin of any outbreak, 10413–10420——Approval of full compensation where animals are slaughtered for cattle plague, 10423——Difficulty in enforcing penalties for concealment of facts; amendment desirable in this respect, 10424–10426. 10458–10461.

Undoubted introduction of cattle plague by the cargo landed at Deptfort, though it has been found impossible to trace any of the outbreaks as directly coming from Deptford, 10427, 10428——Advantage if the dairies were (like the slaughter-houses) under the control of the Metropolitan Board of Works, with a view to improved structural and sanitary arrangements, 10432–10434. 10454–10457——Question considered as to the power of the local authorities to stop animals when being moved in contravention of the Animals Order of 1877; 10435–10437.

Witness further submits that import should be entirely prohibited from Germany and Belgium, and that cattle from other countries should be slaughtered at the port of landing, as the only means of effectually keeping contagious diseases out of the country, 10438–10440——Contemplated maintenance of the cordon round London till the end of 1877; approval of the cordon being permanently continued if cattle from Germany be allowed to come in, 10441–10444——Practical difficulty in keeping up the cordon; modification suggested, 10445, 10446.

Value attached to the services of the police in aid of the inspection, both in London and the country, 10447, 10448——Importance of a staff of competent professional men for the prompt identification of disease throughout the country, before any action is taken, 10449–10452.

Buckinghamshire. Action taken by the local authority of the county under the Cattle Plague Order of January 1877; *App.* 562, 563.

Burkett, Josiah. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is a salesman of American and English dead meat in the Metropolitan Meat Market; receives some large consignments of American meat, 6105–6108——Excellent condition, as a rule, of Mr. Link's consignments on arrival in London, though of late there have been some exceptions; peculiarly good condition of a cargo which came in extremely hot weather, 6109–6117. 6130–6135——Average of about $6\frac{3}{4}d.$ in the pound realised by Mr. Link's consignments from January to May last; average of about $5\frac{1}{4}d.$ as the price fetched by American meat in the previous four months, 6118–6130. 6277–6285.

Conclusion that by care in packing, and by not placing too many quarters in the same chamber, the good condition of the meat may be perfectly secured, and a remunerative price obtained, 6132–6142——Purchase of Mr. Link's consignments by the best butchers when it arrives in good condition, 6143–6151. 6234, 6235. 6286–6288——Excellent quality of American beef, when it arrives in good condition; it is, in fact, surpassed only by Aberdeen beef, 6149–6151. 6227–6235.

Very good condition of some of Mr. Gillett's consignments of American meat, 6152–6159——Particulars as to the keeping properties of American meat in hot and cold weather; it will keep better than English meat, but not so well as that from Aberdeen, 6160–6170. 6267–6270. 6301, 6302——Facilities of butchers, by means of refrigerated storehouses, for keeping large supplies of American meat for about a week, and so regulating the market, 6167–6170. 6179–6181. 6398–6401.

Very bad condition of some American meat sold by Mr. Pool, as agent; negligence to which owing, 6171–6176——Practice of some butchers as to daily purchases of dead meat;

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Burkett, Josiah. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

meat; advantage taken by them of a glut in the market, 6177-6181——Increasing purchases of dead meat in the central market, many butchers having given up slaughtering, and relying less upon live animals, 6181-6194. 6313-6315. 6335-6337.

Immense trade carried on at Tallerman's stores, chiefly in American meat, the price to the public having been fixed for three months certain; loss at times through the necessity of falling back on Scotch meat, 6195-6202. 6316-6319——Large and increasing trade in Aberdeen dead meat; excellent condition in which it arrives in London, and high price realised, 6203-6214. 6340-6343——Contemplated import of dead meat from Vienna; belief that no serious difficulty would be experienced, 6215-6218. 6329-6332.

Considerable supplies of dead meat from Denmark and Tonning; facility in transmission, without any refrigerating process, 6219-6226——Better quality of American than of Continental dead meat, so that the latter can hardly stand competition with the former, 6227-6230——Prejudice against American beef, on account of the bad colour, though not really any symptom of inferior quality; comment upon its exclusion from Government establishments and from workhouses, 6231-6233. 6296-6300. 6320-6328.

Grounds for the conclusion that largely increased supplies of American beef, in good condition, may safely be calculated upon, 6236, 6237. 6261-6266. 6372-6376. 6415, 6416. 6445-6448——Very large quantity sent by Mr. Eastman, the quality being excellent, 6237, 6238——Very good condition of some American meat sent from Glasgow to the London market, 6240-6245.

Belief that regular and sufficient supplies of dead meat might be had, in the absence of any import of live cattle, 6246-6249. 6254——Necessity of the continued import of sheep; obstacle to the import of mutton in good condition, 6250-6253. 6368-6371——Effect of the restriction upon import of live stock in raising the price of common or contractors' meat, 6254-6260——Lower price, by about 1½*d.* per pound, of the best American beef than of English beef, whilst it is about 2*d.* cheaper than Aberdeen beef, 6271, 6272.

Tendency to reduction of price by stopping the import of live cattle, if dead meat came in increased quantities from the Continent and from America, and if there be increased breeding of English cattle, 6273-6276. 6333, 6334. 6449-6459——Belief that some meat sold as Australian, and objected to on the score of its appearance, was not really Australian, 6289-6295——Room for improvement in the mode of transmission of the Aberdeen meat to London, 6301-6307——Expected continuance of the dead meat supply from Aberdeen, concurrently with the American supply; relative increase in this supply, and in the live cattle supply from Scotland, 6308-6312. 6340-6347.

Doubt as to a dead meat supply being likely to come from Ireland, the quality not being sufficiently good, 6338, 6339. 6348-6352——Inferior character of the dead meat from Denmark; unsatisfactory condition in which it sometimes arrives, 6353-6359——Increase in the price of meat if the import of live cattle be prohibited, unless dead meat should be substituted for the live supply; difficulty as to such substitution permanently in the case of the Continent but not of America, 6361-6367. 6412-6439. 6445-6479.

Objection in the provinces to the use of American meat in summer, the colour being against it, 6377-6382——Facility of bringing dead meat in good condition from the Continent, 6383-6392——Good condition in which offal may be brought from the Continent as well as from America, 6393-6397.

Examination with further reference to the probable effect upon the price by diminishing the supply, as by prohibiting the import of live cattle; question on the other hand, whether this may not be counterbalanced by increased import of dead meat, 6404-6439. 6445-6479——Superior character of American cattle; difficulty in importing them profitably, except in the form of dead meat, 6440-6444.

Butchers. Preference of butchers for a live cattle trade, the "fifth quarter" never being accounted for, *Sir C. A. Wood* 7487——Depressed state of the butchers' trade at the present time; less profit on American meat than on foreign cattle slaughtered at home, *Walker* 7888-7895——Room for much improvement in the system of butchering in this country, *Read* 9553, 9554.——*See* also *American Dead Meat*, ix.

C.

Calves. Comment upon the premature killing of home-bred cattle, instead of the calves being kept for stores, *Giblett* 6644. 6671-6674. 6766, 6767.

Canada. Expediency of treating Canada as part of the United Kingdom so long as no disease exists there, *Hall* 2923——Improbability of any danger from the import of live stock from Canada; witness would prefer, however, to prohibit all import, *Gamgee* 6996, 6997. 7003, 7004.

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Carcases (*Diseased Animals*). Particulars relative to the meat of animals that have been slaughtered for cattle plague; difficulty in detecting any symptom of disease unless it has been very far advanced, *Brown* 180-183——Circumstances under which an animal suffering from pleuro-pneumonia may be fit for food, *Lyon* 3320——Belief that, except the lungs, the carcase is fit for food, in the case of an animal killed in the early stages of pleuro-pneumonia, *Wilson* 4814——Wholesome character of the meat of animals slaughtered for pleuro-pneumonia, *Read* 9582-9587——Comment upon the practice in Ireland of not using for food the carcases of animals attacked with pleuro-pneumonia, *ib.* 9582-9584.

Expediency of diseased carcases being buried, instead of boiled down, *Gebhardt* 5162-5164—— Difficulty as to the burial of diseased carcases in London, so that they are boiled down, *Brown* 10289——Probable conveyance of disease by cats who have fed on the carcases, *ib.* 10289. 10370-10372—— Want of arrangements for keeping cats out of slaughter-houses, and out of contact with diseased carcases, *ib.* 10370-10372. 10399, 10400.

Regulations in the Animals Order of 1875 as to the mode of dealing with carcases, *App.* 524, 525.

"*Castor*," *The.* See *Cattle Plague*, 2. 5-7.

Cattle Dealers. Grounds for advising that cattle dealers be licensed, *Howard* 8237-8239. 8242; *Read* 9758——Exception taken to the compulsory licensing of dealers in Scotland, *Melvin* 8850-8852.

Cattle Drovers. Decided improvement if all cattle drovers were licensed, *Sir C. A. Wood* 7407, 7408. 7447, 7448; *Read* 9758——Inconvenience if all drovers in Scotland were required to be licensed, *Melvin* 8850-8852——Suggestion that drovers at fairs and markets be licensed; proposed exemption of labourers on individual farms, *Howard* 8240-8242. 8291-8293.

Cattle Plague:

1. *Introduction of Cattle Plague into England from Abroad; Immunity otherwise.*
2. *Particulars in connection with recent Outbreaks in January and July* 1877.
3. *Outbreaks in* 1865 *and* 1872.
4. *Outbreak in Ireland in* 1866.
5. *Measures adopted by the Privy Council, and effect thereof; several Orders of Council on the Subject.*
6. *Arrangements for obtaining Information from Abroad; amended Regulations required.*
7. *Difficulty in obtaining prompt Information from Owners in this Country.*
8. *Infectious Nature of the Disease.*
9. *Period of Incubation.*
10. *Losses from Cattle Plague.*
11. *Suggestions on the Subject of Prohibition of Import.*
12. *Full Powers and Prompt Action necessary as regards the Slaughter of Diseased Animals.*
13. *Action taken by Local Authorities.*
14. *Conclusions of the Committee.*

1. *Introduction of Cattle Plague into England from Abroad; Immunity otherwise:*

Non-existence of cattle plague in this country, unless when introduced from Germany and Russia, *Brown* 947, 948. 1023——Cattle plague undoubtedly introduced into England from Russia, *Simonds* 1122, 1123.

Dissent from some of the statements made by Professor Brown in connection with cattle plague, and its introduction into England from Germany, *Müller* 1454-1463——Existence, at the present time, of cattle plague in Poland; certainty of its existing in Roumania, because it follows the Russian army, *ib.* 1479-1491——Great advantage possessed by England as regards immunity from disease, on account of its insular position, *Baron Von Behr* 2601.

Very little cattle plague in England since the great outbreak of 1865; *Rea* 3674——Introduction of the first outbreak of the disease from abroad, *ib.* 3683-3685.

Exception taken to the view that the cattle plague in England, about 100 years ago, originated at home, *Sheldon* 4548-4556——Conclusion that rinderpest was brought into England in the last century, *Gamgee* 7187-7192——There is no case of cattle plague now in this country (6th July 1877); *Brown* 9873.

2. *Particulars*

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Cattle Plague—continued.

2. *Particulars in connection with recent Outbreaks in January and July* 1877:

Information as to the outbreak early in 1877, and the circumstances which caused it to spread, and the protective measures adopted; belief that the infection was spread by mediate contagion, *Brown* 55–90. 145–148. 192–232. 244–267——Particulars with reference more especially to the cattle brought to Deptford in the "Castor," all of them having been affected with cattle plague; action taken at Deptford in regard to these cattle, *ib.* 62–89——Appearance of the cattle plague in widely different quarters subsequent to its discovery at Deptford, *ib.* 98–102. 106, 107. 112–114. 116. 119–122. 126–128. 132–142. 197–205. 211–228.

Statement that several recent cases in the metropolis have turned out not to be cattle plague, *Brown* 504——Further expression of opinion that some recent cases of disease in London were not cattle plague, *ib.* 881–883.

Further explanation with reference to the introduction of diseased animals on board the "Castor," from Hamburg, *Brown* 934–939. 1022.

Information respecting the diseased cattle which were brought to England in the "Castor"; superficial examination made by the veterinary inspector in Germany, for which he has since been severely punished, *Müller* 1421, 1422. 1469–1476. 1525–1534. 1556–1562.

Way in which cattle plague was probably introduced by means of the "Castor," *Odams* 8074——Delay in the disinfection of the "Castor"; belief that the disease did not break out from Deptford Market, but was conveyed by the ship to Limehouse, *Read* 9489. 9524, 9525. 9727.

Particulars in connection with a recent outbreak of cattle plague (detected on the 14th July) in Bethnal Green, within less than half-a-mile of previous outbreaks on 17th May and 17th March; inquiries made and action taken by the Privy Council, but without being able yet to trace the origin of the outbreak, *Brown* 10282–10295. 10300–10311. 10342–10378——Way in which the recent outbreak in Bethnal Green was discovered, *ib.* 10300, 10301——Probability that the disease was introduced into the dairy shed by a cow brought in by a man named Plummer, *ib.* 10305–10311. 10355–10360. 10378. 10462.

Further consideration of the question as to the origin of the recent outbreak; difficulties in the way of a definite conclusion on the subject, *Brown* 10303–10311. 10342–10378. 10462, 10463——Grounds for the conclusion that cattle plague has existed for the last few months in certain dairies in London, though it has not been known to exist; hence the recent outbreak, *ib.* 10347–10352. 10390. 10404–10411. 10421, 10422——Conviction of witness that the last outbreak did not arise spontaneously; nor was it directly imported, *ib.* 10404–10413. 10421, 10422.

Undoubted introduction of cattle plague by the cargo landed at Deptford, though it has been found impossible to trace any of the outbreaks as directly coming from Deptford, *Brown* 10427, 10428.

Witness submits particulars in connection with the dairy shed in Bethnal Green in which cattle plague has recently appeared; he supplied two cows to this shed, but they were perfectly healthy, and he cannot account for the origin of the outbreak, *Payne* 10466–10488. 10499–10522. 10534–10541——Witness has seen the shed, which holds about a dozen cows; it is airy, and seems well ventilated, *ib.* 10477–10481. 10536–10538.

Paper showing the number of places where the disease appeared in 1877, the number of animals attacked, the number slaughtered, &c., *App.* 510.

3. *Outbreaks in* 1865 *and* 1872:

Appearance of the cattle plague in England in June 1865, it not having been finally extinguished till 1867; summary of measures adopted during this period, *Brown* 2.

Explanations in connection with the outbreak in 1872, and the effect of the measures adopted in that year, *Brown* 10–17——Impression that the information respecting the outbreak of cattle plague in 1872 was given by one of the importers of the diseased animals; manner in which the plague was stamped out in that year, *ib.* 630–636——Statement that notwithstanding forty-eight carcases were washed ashore on the Lincolnshire coast in 1872, there was no disease in consequence, *ib.* 637——Circumstances under which the cattle plague came to us from the Continent in 1872; belief that in this case the movement of Russian troops had no influence upon the outbreak, *ib.* 638–648.

Information relative to the total amount of losses during the outbreak from 1865 to 1867, and the cost of dealing with the outbreak; belief that a large amount of these losses would have been saved if we had adopted the continental system of stamping on the disease instead of trying experiments as to treatment, *Brown* 857–860. 891–895.

CATTLE PLAGUE—continued.

3 *Outbreaks in* 1865 *and* 1872—continued.

903-905. 989-994——One-third of a million of cattle destroyed by the last great outbreak of cattle plague in 1865-67; enormous loss represented, *Brown* 857-860.

Information in regard to the great losses suffered by the country on account of cattle plague between the years 1865 and 1867; the loss in 1872 was very much less, *Simonds* 1183-1189. 1192. 1258-1265. 1292-1296.

Paper submitted by Professor Brown showing the number of places where the disease appeared in 1872, the number of animals attacked, the number slaughtered, &c., *App.* 510.

4. *Outbreak in Ireland in* 1866:

Circumstances respecting the very mild outbreak which occurred in Ireland in 1866; non-extension of the disease in that country due to the prompt and energetic action of the Irish Government, *Brown* 884-888.

5. *Measures adopted by the Privy Council, and effect thereof; several Orders in Council on the Subject:*

Summary of the measures adopted by the Veterinary Department of the Privy Council since the outbreak in 1865-66, *Brown* 2-8——Orders and circulars issued from the Veterinary Department immediately upon the discovery of the cattle plague in London and Hull; prohibition of fairs and markets in the East Riding under an order of the Privy Council, *ib.* 88. 117-125. 169-172——Three orders passed on the 27th April 1877, with a view to preventing the spread of cattle plague from the metropolis, *ib.* 505. 506——Explanation that the measures now in force are those contained in the Order in Council of 16th April, the Privy Council taking the action of the local authority from that date, *ib.*

Satisfactory regulations which at present exist with reference to the importation of fat animals; belief that the last introduction of cattle plague was mainly due to the neglect of the Corporation of London in not carrying out the orders for immediate slaughter of infected animals, *Lyon* 3212-3220.

As clerk of the Privy Council, witness submits the orders and regulations having reference to the outbreak of cattle plague in the present year, *Peel* 2604-2611; *App.* 544 *et seq.*——Orders of Council which have been passed since the Committee of 1873; these Orders represent a complete history of the action of the Privy Council in regard to cattle plague, *Peel* 3809-3813; *App.* 512 *et seq.*

Satisfactory regulations now adopted by the Privy Council for the prevention of cattle plague in London; prompt action necessary, *Lyon* 3346-3349——Undue delay, after the arrival of the "Castor" at Deptford, before they were killed and destroyed; dilatory and defective course pursued in boiling down the bodies, *Gebhardt* 5143, 5144. 5162-5170——Improved practice in stamping out cattle plague, *Odams* 8076, 8077.

Explanation of the recent action of the Privy Council, and of the orders now in force in the country and in the metropolis, in reference to cattle plague, &c.; cordon still maintained round the metropolis pending the re-stocking of the infected dairies, *Peel* 9865-9870.

Recapitulation of the circumstances connected with the recent introduction of cattle plague by means of the cargo of the "Castor"; undue delay on the part of the Privy Council in exercising their powers under the Act of 1869, *Read* 9489-9498.

Explanation of the delay before the Privy Council interfered with the local authorities on the last outbreak of cattle plague, *Brown* 9934-9937. 10164-10166——Inaccuracy of a certain statement as to the Privy Council having been remiss in taking action in the case of the "Castor," *ib.* 10025, 10026——Effectual steps taken in reference to the recent outbreak at Bethnal Green, in July, for stamping out the disease, and for preventing infection, *ib.* 10302.

Orders of Council dated 31st January 1877, relative to the measures to be taken for the suppression of cattle plague in the metropolis, *App.* 544——Subsequent Orders submitting regulations for the country as well as the metropolis, *ib.* 544 *et seq.*

Orders of Council of 18th and 19th July 1877, imposing restriction upon movement in the metropolis, in view of the further outbreak of cattle plague, *App.* 604, 605.

6. *Arrangements for obtaining Information from Abroad; amended Regulations required:*

Instances, in 1869, 1872, and 1877, of the disease having been introduced from abroad, without official information from the country whence the cattle were imported, *Brown* 10-13——Establishment of regulations for the purpose of procuring early information as to outbreaks of cattle plague on the Continent; insufficiency of this information in every case, *ib.* 33-35. 55-64. 269——Absence of any official notification as to an outbreak in Germany upon the occasion of the arrival of the "Castor" from Hamburg, *ib.* 64-71.

Explanation

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Cattle Plague—continued.

6. *Arrangements for obtaining Information from Abroad, &c.*—continued.

Explanation of the delay in transmitting from Germany to England information in regard to the late outbreak of cattle plague; in future the Prussian Government will telegraph to England by means of every local authority, and not by the central authority only, *Müller* 1403-1409. 1421.

Advantageous arrangements made between the Governments of England and Holland as to telegraphic communication on any outbreak of disease, *May* 2068-2073.

Undue delay on the part of the authorities of Hamburg in telegraphing information as to the outbreak of cattle plague in reference to the cargo of the "Castor"; prohibition of the landing of these cattle if a telegram had been sent direct to the Privy Council, *Gebhardt* 5135-5142. 5147——Importance of direct telegraphic communication from the inspector abroad to the Privy Council in reference to outbreaks of cattle plague, *ib.* 5137-5142. 5146, 5147.

Better check, doubtless, as regards cattle plague, if there were immediate and telegraphic communication from any locality abroad where it may be detected, *Brown* 10025-10028.

7. *Difficulty in obtaining prompt Information from Owners in this Country:*

Belief that in the recent case of cattle plague the owner did not intend to give information; intention of prosecuting him for not giving notice, *Brown* 10300——Doubt as to the advantage of a power to examine on oath, in order the better to ascertain the origin of any outbreak, *ib.* 10413-10420.

8. *Infectious Nature of the Disease:*

Communication of cattle plague by particles of dead animals, and also by meat which has been affected by the disease; impossibility of detecting meat which comes from a diseased animal, *Brown* 154-158. 180-185——Danger of spreading the disease by people moving about in their several trades connected with cattle, *ib.* 211-222——Possibility of an outbreak of cattle plague occurring six weeks after a place has been declared free, without any probable evidence of communication being obtainable, *ib.* 241.

Undoubted possibility of conveying cattle plague by means of dead meat, but in a slighter degree than by the living animal; character of the supervision exercised over the meat sent into the market from animals which have had the disease in its earlier stage, *Brown* 949-955——Disease not communicable by means of the milk of an animal in which cattle plague was incubating, *ib.* 956.

Belief that calves born from a mother that had cattle plague during pregnancy are insusceptible of disease; scientific explanation of this immunity, *Simonds* 1143. 1199-1202. 1205, 1206.

Great difficulty experienced in discovering the first cases of disease in the markets; opinion that it is more easily discovered in the living animal than in the dead carcase, *Müller* 1396-1399. 1612-1616—— Infrequency of cattle plague being carried by mediate contagion; possibility of carrying it by means of manure adhering to the feet, *ib.* 1551-1555. 1570-1578——Frequent instances in Germany of the cattle plague being communicated by means of dead meat, *ib.* 1613-1616.

9. *Period of Incubation:*

The incubation period of cattle plague varies from four to seven days, *Brown* 51.

10. *Losses from Cattle Plague:*

Successful result of the late severe restrictions as regards cattle plague, so that the direct loss has been only 10,000 *l.* or 12,000 *l.*, *Brown* 827-833——Belief that in future there will be no serious loss from cattle plague on account of the efficient precautions to be adopted, *ib.* 1036-1038.

Prejudicial effect on the meat trade and food supply of the country when there is an outbreak of the cattle plague, *Lyon* 3184, 3185. 3445, 3446——Opinion that cattle plague is more to be dreaded by the farmers than pleuro-pneumonia, *Rea* 3699-3703.

Belief that the indirect loss to the country by the cattle plague in 1865 was double the direct loss, the latter being estimated at 5,000,000 *l.*, *Wilson* 4736-4738——Reduced losses from cattle plague by reason of the prompt remedies applied for its suppression, *Gamgee* 6976-6982.

11. *Suggestions on the Subject of Prohibition of Import:*

Argument that the only way of dealing with cattle plague is to prohibit the importation of live cattle from those countries where cattle plague has been certified to exist; necessity also of prohibiting meat and all animal products which might be likely to convey the disease, *Brown* 314-344——Proposal in reference to cattle plague that the importation from Germany and Belgium should be unconditionally prohibited; belief that the loss to this country would be compensated by the amount of dead meat which they would send us, *ib.* 509-513.

Report, 1877—*continued.*

CATTLE PLAGUE—continued.

11. *Suggestions on the Subject of Prohibition of Import*—continued.

Additional recommendations as to the means to be adopted for preventing the introduction of cattle plague into England; necessity for entirely shutting out cattle, but not sheep from Germany, *Brown* 699-714. 722-724. 834-845. 853-856. 862-867——Conclusion further expressed as to the absolute necessity of prohibiting the importation of cattle from those countries in which cattle plague exists, *ib.* 889, 890. 976-978. 1022. 1068-1070.

Grounds for the belief that it would be exceedingly difficult under any circumstances to protect this country from the introduction of cattle plague, *Simonds* 1124-1129——Concurrence with Professor Brown's opinion that if it be desired to effectually stamp out cattle plague in England, the importation from Germany and Belgium must be absolutely prohibited, *ib.* 1147. 1190, 1191. 1217——Insufficient protection by means merely of slaughter at the port of debarkation, *Simonds* 1197. 1208; *Wilson* 4701. 4704——Inexpediency of prohibiting the importation of cattle merely from any single place, *Simonds* 1208-1210.

Evidence as to the expediency of admitting cattle without restriction from countries free from disease, and absolutely prohibiting their import alive in the event of cattle plague breaking out, *Swan* 1650, 1651. 1683-1690. 1730-1732——Proposals respecting the restrictions for the suppression of the cattle plague in England; recommendation that importation be totally prohibited, and failing this, that importation be prohibited from any country in which there exists any disease whatever, *Booth* 2350-2355. 2361. 2376-2379. 2428-2430. 2459-2461.

Suggestions as to future precautions to protect the ports from any introduction of cattle plague; necessity for treating as scheduled countries only those in which cattle plague exists, or where there is a probability of its breaking out, *Lyon* 3220-3228——Absence of danger of an outbreak of cattle plague by the continued import of cattle from the Continent, inasmuch as the animals are only brought from countries where the disease does not and never did exist, *ib.* 3303.

Preference for total prohibition of import in view of the liability of Germany to cattle plague from Russia, *Wilson* 4976——Approval of a strict prohibition of import from any country from which cattle plague may be brought, *Giblett* 6566-6568. 6588. 6719.

Advocacy of a prohibition upon the import of live stock, whilst there should be but little restriction upon the home trade, *Gamgee* 6940 *et seq.*; 7033-7036. 7056, 7057. 7085-7103——Disease and scarcity in the period from 1714 to 1770, cattle plague having been imported, whilst from 1770 to 1840 (when there was no import of foreign cattle) the home supply greatly increased and the price of meat was much cheaper, *ib.* 6999.

Examination upon the question whether in the reign of George 2 an Act was not passed prohibiting import on account of the cattle plague in the country; denial that there was complete exclusion of foreign cattle previously to the outbreak in former times, *Gamgee* 7181-7196. 7236-7238——Reference to an Act of Charles 2 prohibiting the import of foreign cattle, as having been passed irrespectively of the cattle plague, *ib.* 7236-7238.

Opinion that the import of cattle should be stopped from any country where cattle plague has been known to exist, *Soulby* 7258-7260. 7265. 7268, 7269——Approval of absolute prohibition of import from any country where there is cattle plague, *Rudkin* 8982.

Explanation that witness would entirely prohibit import from all countries where there is any chance of cattle plague, including not only Germany but Belgium, *Read* 9577-9579. 9649-9659. 9724-9727. 9759.

Further expression of the opinion that protection can best be secured against cattle plague by prohibiting the import of cattle from Germany and Belgium, and also from France unless she adopts the required precautions for guarding her frontier, *Brown* 9906, 9907. 10438-10440.

12. *Full Powers and prompt Action necessary as regards the Slaughter of Diseased Animals:*

Opinion that the authorities should have full power as in Germany to slaughter in any case in which they may be advised that it is necessary; conviction that if they had had this power in 1872, the cattle plague in East Yorkshire would have been stamped out at the time it appeared, *Brown* 14-19. 142——Firm conviction of witness that he has in several past cases slaughtered animals unnecessarily upon such evidence as he would not now be satisfied with, *ib.* 258-268.

Statement that the recent outbreak of cattle plague has undoubtedly confirmed the opinion of witness that there should be power to order the slaughter of animals; grounds for the belief that if the authorities had had this power the disease might have been extinguished in less than a month, *Brown* 574-579. 671-679.

Furthe

Report, 1877—*continued.*

CATTLE PLAGUE—continued.

12. *Full Powers and prompt Action necessary as regards the Slaughter, &c* —cont^d.

Further evidence in favour of giving the Privy Council power to slaughter animals within a certain radius, which though not in contact with diseased animals have nevertheless been exposed to infection, *Brown* 957-962. 1078, 1079.

Recommendation that animals suffering fron cattle plague should be at once slaughtered and buried; expediency of slaughtering all cattle in the same herd (though not infected) and sending the meat to market, *Lyon* 3217, 3218. 3225-3227.

13. *Action taken by Local Authorities:*

Total of thirty-six counties and twenty-nine boroughs in which there are restrictions in force as regards cattle plague, *Wilson* 5129.

14. *Conclusions of the Committee:*

Considerable improvement required in the existing regulations, *Rep.* iii——Conclusion that with proper regulations cattle plague might be stamped out in a short time without its becoming as destructive as it was in 1865, *ib.*——Constant risk of the importation of cattle plague from Germany, *ib.*——Necessity of foreign governments generally imposing stricter regulations as to their export trade in live stock, *ib.*

Full powers necessary as to the slaughter of animals on premises adjoining those actually infected; recommendation to this effect, *Rep.* iii. ix.

Conclusions arrived at in favour of prohibition of import from Russia, Germany, and Belgium, *Rep.* vi. ix.

See also *Compensation. Denmark. Deptford Market. Fairs and Markets. Foreign Cattle. Germany. Holland. Home Supply. Hull. Inspection. International Arrangements. Mediate Contagion. Movement of Cattle. Russia. Schleswig-Holstein. Sheep.*

Cattle Salesmen. Larger profit obtained by salesmen in Scotland from the sale of imported dead meat than from the sale of imported live stock, *Swan* 1734-1739——Larger commission paid upon dead meat than upon live animals, *Hall* 2942-2944——The commission upon the sale of carcases is double that for selling live stock, *Lambert* 4082-4085.

Very large business of witness in the live cattle trade exclusively; if this were abolished he could enter into the dead meat trade, *Gebhardt* 5456, 5457. 5523-5531——Injury to witness' business by excluding foreign cattle; explanation thereon that he advocates the interests of importers in the matter, and not of salesmen, *Giblett* 6752-6755.

Direct interest of Mr. Giblett and other cattle salesmen in upholding the import of live cattle, and in opposing development of the dead meat made; twice as much commission is charged for the sale of a foreign bullock as of an English bullock, *Gamgee* 7228-7235——Relative charges of salesmen for the sale of foreign and of English bullocks, *Odams* 8109, 8110——Interested motives by which cattle salesmen are actuated in opposing restrictions upon the import of live stock, *Rudkin* 9104, 9105.

Denial given by salesmen to a statement as to their charging a different commission for foreign and English cattle, *Brown* 10042, 10043.

Improvement if cattle salesmen were licensed, *Read* 9758.

CATTLE SHIPS:

Belief that the proposed restrictions in regard to vessels and crews would probably enhance freights, but would not drive vessels out of the cattle trade altogether, *Brown* 1027-1030——Importance of ships for cattle exclusively; prospect of such vesssls being provided, *ib.* 1030, 1031. 1090-1093.

Information relative to the fittings of the ships in which live stock are imported from America into Scotland, *Swan* 1801-1808——Loss of weight by live cattle coming from abroad; the loss would be less when transported a shorter distance by rail, *Lambert* 4049-4055. 4077-4081.

Suggestion that cattle ships be specially fitted and ventilated, be licensed to carry only a certain number, and be used for cattle exclusively, *Wilson* 4822-4825. 4947——Admission as to the virtual prohibition upon the import of live cattle from America if the vessels were not allowed to carry any other freight; witness proposes the latter restriction only as regards the Continent, *ib.* 5027-5035.

Somewhat similar arrangements in the Irish and American boats for the separation of the cattle, *Luya* 7765-7770——Belief as to the constant development of disease in the holds of vessels, *Odams* 7937. 7946. 8030——Conclusion as to the deterioration of live cattle on board steamers, *ib.* 7979-7981——Expediency of foreign store cattle being transported on deck, *ib.* 8030, 8131. 8138, 8139——Improved arrangements for the disinfection of cattle ships, *ib.* 8075.

Report, 1877—*continued.*

CATTLE SHIPS—continued.

Use of ships for cattle exclusively from some countries, whilst from others cattle come with other cargoes, *Robinson* 8554——Opinion that the arrangements in the boats for cattle exclusively are not any better than in the cargo boats, *ib.* 8555-8558——Grounds for the opinion that contagious diseases are not engendered on board ship, *Melvin* 8781, 8782.

Security to be obtained by having special cattle ships, coming to particular ports, and by carefully disinfecting the vessels and the men in charge of the cattle, *Brown* 9930-9932——Improvement if vessels were used and fitted for cattle exclusively; difficulty on the score of expense, *ib.* 9960-9964.

Regulations in the Animals Order of 1875 as to the cleansing and disinfection of cattle ships, *App.* 523.

See also *Ireland, and Irish Cattle*, 1-3.

Central Chamber of Agriculture. Recommendations made by the Central Chamber of Agriculture to the Privy Council with reference to foreign import, slaughter at the port port of debarkation, quarantine, home restrictions, &c., *Stratton* 6788——Explanation that the Central Chamber would prefer slaughter at the port of embarkation, though asking only for slaughter on landing in England, *ib.* 6876-6879. 6902-6910.

As representing the Central Chamber of Agriculture, witness submits that all foreign cattle coming in the holds of vessels should be slaughtered at the port of debarkation, *Odams* 7934 *et seq.*——The Central Chamber comprises some forty-eight chambers from different parts of the country, *ib.* 7960, 7961.

Views of the Privy Council authorities in reference to the measures advocated in memorial from the Central Chamber of Agriculture and the farmers' club, *App.* 566, 567.

Resolutions adopted at a council meeting of the Central Associated Chambers of Agriculture as to the stringent measures necessary as regards foreign cattle, *App.* 568.

Channel Islands. Doubt as to the necessity of slaughtering or quarantining cattle sent from the Channel Islands to Southampton; advantage of inspection before shipment, *Read* 9712-9716. 9748, 9749——Approval of the present facilities of import from the Channel Islands, the animals being detained for some time at the landing place, *Brown* 10045-10049. 10105, 10106. 10258. 10260.

Recommendation by the Committee that the restrictions applicable to Great Britain should be extended to the Channel Islands, or else that ports should be specified to which alone importation of live animals from the Channel Islands should be lawful, the animals not being permitted to be taken inland unless examined and passed by a Privy Council inspector at the port of debarkation, *Rep.* v. viii. ix.

COMPENSATION (*COMPULSORY SLAUGHTER*):

Power in the local authority to pay compensation in the case of pleuro-pneumonia to the extent of three-fourths of the value of the animals, *Brown* 607-609——Compensation in the case of cattle plague to the extent of one-half the value of diseased animals, and three-fourths of the value of animals which have been herded with them, but are not actually diseased, *ib.* 610-615.

Expediency of full compensations chiefly with the object of inducing owners to give notice of disease; possibility in the event of increasing the compensation of the Privy Council taking more stringent measures to restrict the movement of animals, *Brown* 963, 964. 973, 974.

Grounds for the conclusion that the full value should be paid as compensation for diseased animals or animals in contact with diseased animals slaughtered upon information given by the owner; certificate to be given in each case by the local inspector, *Wilson* 4805-4818——Allowance to be made (in awarding compensation) for the value of the carcase as food, *ib.* 4814-4817——Opinion that compensation should be defrayed from Imperial rather than from local sources, *ib.* 4819-4821——Facility of settling the amount of compensation for cattle slaughtered by order of the Privy Council, *ib.* 4923, 4924.

Opinion that three-fourths of the value should be given as compensation when an animal is slaughtered for cattle plague as for pleuro-pneumonia, *Soulby* 7285-7288——Question of compensation considered; opinion that the public should pay to prevent concealment of disease, *Howard* 8229-8234.

Suggestions for the payment of compensation out of the Consolidated Fund in respect of animals slaughtered for cattle plague, *Read* 9493. 9499, 9500——Opinion that half the value might be given in the case of animals attacked with cattle plague, but that the full value should be given for animals slaughtered that have been associated with those actually attacked, *ib.* 9500.

Advantage

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Compensation (Compulsory Slaughter)—continued.

Advantage if compensation were not given where information is withheld by the owner, *Brown* 10300——Insufficiency of the compensation as an inducement to owners to give notice of disease; that is, on account of the great interruption of business necessarily entailed by the restrictions, *ib.* 10315. 10379–10381. 10423——Approval of full compensation where animals are slaughtered for cattle plague, *ib* 10423.

Opinion of the Committee that the full value, up to 40 *l.*, should be paid in cases of slaughter for suspected cattle plague; recommendation to this effect, *Rep.* iv. ix.

Grounds upon which the Committee recommend that all compensation for animals slaughtered in respect of cattle plague should be defrayed from Imperial funds, *Rep.* iii. x.

Recommendation that in the case of pleuro-pneumonia the compensation for the slaughter of animals, whether suspected or diseased, should be at the same rate as in the case of cattle plague, but should be payable out of local funds, *Rep.* ix.

See also *Germany*, 4. *Holland*, 5.

Compulsory Slaughter. See *Cattle Plague*, 12. *Compensation. Dead Meat. Foot-and-Mouth Disease*, 4. *Foreign Cattle*, II. IV. *Pleuro-pneumonia*, 4.

Concealment of Disease. See *Cattle Plague*, 7. *Compensation. Penalties.*

Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act. Passing of this Act in August 1869, it being still in force, *Brown* 2——Pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease defined as contagious diseases for the first time in the Act of 1869, *ib.*——Power under the Act to define the limits of ports, whilst certain countries were enumerated from which animals could only be imported for the purpose of slaughter, *ib.* 3.

Beneficial operation on the whole of the Act of 1869, *Howard* 8177, 8178.

Continental Supply. See *Foreign Cattle.*

Cork. Very good cattle depôt at Cork belonging to the Cork Steam Ship Company, *Sir C. A. Wood* 7397–7399——Consideration and approval of the detailed arrangements at the port of Cork up to the point of shipment of live stock for England, *Robinson* 8661–8673.——See also *Ireland, and Irish Cattle.*

Cows. Means of dispensing with the import of Dutch cows for dairy purposes, *Wilson* 5120-5123——Non-objection to the import of dairy cows into London, provided they are not sent to Islington Market, *Gebhardt* 5704–5710——Consideration of the extent to which cows with pleuro-pneumonia are imported from Holland into the London dairy sheds, *Pool* 5905–5914; *Robinson* 8610-8617——Careful restrictions under which dairy cows might be imported, *Adams* 8054; *Read* 9504, 9505. 9513.

Import of from 8,000 to 10,000 cows yearly, mainly from Holland, this being practically the only import of store cattle, *Robinson* 8607–8609——Inferiority of the Danish cows to the Dutch cows; relative prices of these and of English and Scotch cows, *Melvin* 8879. 8908. 8920–8922——Belief as to its being impracticable to exclude disease unless Dutch cows be excluded, *ib.* 8909, 8910.

Practice of witness to quarantine any new cows on his farm for at least three weeks; he has had an immunity from disease, *Rudkin* 8995–9000——Quarantine necessary for foreign milch cows if allowed to be imported, *Rudkin* 9170–9172. 9211, 9212; *Tisdall* 9363, 9364——Sufficient supply of good milch cows at home without any import, *Rudkin* 9173, 9174. 9212.

Recommendation by the Metropolitan Dairymen's Society, that all milch cows from abroad should undergo a quarantine of fourteen days, *Tisdall* 9363, 9364.

Existences of pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease amongst witness' cows, though only to a limited extent since he has given up buying in the London market; reference hereon to the modes of introduction of these diseases, *Tisdall* 9376-9388——Decided preference of witness for English shorthorns as compared with Dutch cows; conclusion as to the former being the better milkers, *ib.* 9390–9395. 9445–9452. 9470–9472——Personal opinion of witness that the advantage as regards Dutch cows does not compensate for the risk of disease, *ib.* 9407–9412. 9477–9481——Comparatively small import of store cattle into London, so that the supply could be dispensed with without increasing the price of milk, *ib.* 9483–9485.

Conclusion as to dairy cows coming under the definition of store stock, *Read* 9728——Opinion that the dairies can be well supplied by cows bred at home, if the import of Dutch cows be prohibited, except for slaughter, *Brown* 10198–10203——Large number of cows which pass through witness' hands; he never buys Dutch cows unless they have been in the country for a year or two, *Payne* 10523–10530.

Cows—continued.

Regulations laid down by the Privy Council in June 1875, in reference to the import of milch cows, *App.* 532.

Recommendation by the Committee that store and dairy animals remain in quarantine for fourteen days, and be then placed under inspection for two months, *Rep.* vi. ix.

See also *Daries and Cowsheds.* *Holland.* *Milk.* *Quarantine.* *Store Cattle.*

Cowsheds. See *Dairies and Cowsheds.*

D.

DAIRIES AND COWSHEDS:

1. *Prevalence of the Disease in the Dairies and Cowsheds in London and in large Towns generally.*
2. *Evidence in favour of prohibiting Dairies in the Metropolis and in large Towns.*
3. *Exception taken to the foregoing Proposals.*
4. *Inspection and Control; amended Regulations suggested.*
5. *Disinfection.*
6. *Proposed Quarantine of Dairy Cows from Abroad.*
7. *Conclusions of the Committee.*

1. *Prevalence of Disease in the Dairies and Cowsheds in London and in large Towns generally:*

Decided opinion that the cowsheds in all the large towns are the chief centres of contagious disease, chiefly pleuro-pneumonia; difficulty in abolishing these centres of infection, *Brown* 549–553——Dairies near the large towns in Germany are hot beds of pleuro-pneumonia, *Müller* 1599–1601——Concurrence in the conclusion that dairies in towns are hot beds of infection, more especially as regards pleuro-pneumonia, *Swan* 1693–1696; *Lambert* 3932–3939; *Wilson* 4833–4835. 4851, 4852. 4983.

Way in which the London cowsheds operate in spreading pleuro-pneumonia, *Gebhardt* 5438–5440——The London dairies are as much infected as they were in 1850 and 1851, *Gamgee* 6945——Statement as to the London cowsheds having long been a fruitful source of disease, *Rudkin* 8995——Information as to the mode in which cows are now supplied to the London dairy sheds, are removed from one shed to another; peculiar facilities for the spread of disease under this system, *Brown* 10312–10315.

Constant shifting of the cows in the London dairies; practice, in some cases, of supplying cows without payment on delivery, though witness never adopts this plan, *Payne* 10482–10495. 10530–10533.

2. *Evidence in favour of prohibiting Dairies in the Metropolis and in large Towns generally:*

Conclusion as to the expediency of prohibiting dairies in large towns, *Swan* 1693–1696. 1699. 1723–1725——Witness submits that dairies should be removed from towns altogether; particulars hereon as to the extensive operations of the Aylesbury Dairy Company, and the successful system of refrigeration adopted by the company, *Wilson* 4840–4852. 4893–4898. 5019–5023. 5036. 5067, 5068.

Approval of a prohibition of cowsheds in London, it being feasible to supply all the milk required from the country, *Gebhardt* 5441–5443——Further statement as to the advantage of excluding cows from London dairies on the score of liability to pleuro-pneumonia, *ib.* 5627–5629——Conclusion that it would be much better if all large towns were supplied with milk by means of suburban dairies, *Gamgee* 7012–7014. 7017.

Supply by the London dairies of only fifteen per cent. of the milk used in the metropolis, witness submitting that the whole supply could be much better obtained from the country, and that the London cowsheds should be closed altogether, *Rudkin* 8995, 8996——Concurrence as to the advantage of London and other large towns being supplied with milk entirely from the country, *Tisdall* 9483–9485; *Read* 9698–9702.

Beneficial effect of the exclusion of dairy sheds from large towns, though this could hardly be effected in London on account of the opposition that would arise, *Brown* 10137–10139——Belief as to the number of dairy cows in London having diminished in recent years, *ib.* 10264–10266.

3. *Exception*

Report, 1877—*continued.*

DAIRIES AND COWSHEDS—continued.

3. *Exception taken to the foregoing Proposals:*

Evidence as to the advantage of well-conducted cowsheds or dairies in London, on account of the fecility thereby for supplying milk in a fresher and sweeter condition for the use of nurseries than when the milk has to come from the country, *Tisdall* 9428–9438——Probable supply of one-third or one-fourth of the milk used in London from town dairies, *ib.* 9439, 9440.

4. *Inspection and Control; amended Regulations suggested:*

Instructions given to the inspectors in the London districts in regard to their visits to dairies; few instances in which objections were made by the owners to these visits, *Brown* 172–179. 186–196——Approval of the cowsheds in London being under the local authority, *Lyon* 3350–3352——Necessity for more stringent regulations governing the inspection of dairy stock, 3932–3939.

Great want of further restrictions upon the movement of cows in and out of town dairies, *Wilton* 4834. 4838–4840——Approval of inspection before an animal is removed from a dairy shed, *Pool* 5915, 5916——Expected readiness of dairymen in the metropolis to submit to strict regulations for the suppression of lung disease, *Gamgee* 7008. 7017–7019—— Stringent regulations desirable as regards the London cowsheds, *Adams* 8005–8008.

Expediency of placing town dairies under stringent regulations, instead of abolishing them altogether, *Melvin* 8847–8849. 8876–8878. 8906, 8907——Want of a thorough inspection of all cowsheds in London and elsewhere, *Rudkin* 9001, 9002——Approval of increased facilities for the entry of inspectors into dairy yards, *Tisdall* 9400–9403.

Approval of additional power in the local authorities as to the control of cowsheds, *Brown* 10196——Unsatisfactory character of the present inspection of dairy sheds; information proposed to be obtained in future by means of the police, *ib.* 10298, 10299. 10316–10318—— Conclusion as to the necessity of applying more stringent regulations and an improved inspection to the London dairy sheds, *ib.* 10316–10318.

Belief that by proper precautions an effectual and constant inspection may be applied to the London dairies, without danger of disease being conveyed by means of the inspectors from one dairy to another, *Brown* 10382–10389——Several instances of unlicensed dairies; amendment desirable on this score, *ib.* 10392, 10393. 10429–10431——Power of entry of sanitary officers into dairies; these officers are of little use in the detection of disease, *ib.* 10394–10396——Difficulties in the way of a registration of the cows in dairies, as a check upon movement, *ib.* 10396, 10397.

Advantage if the dairies were (like the slaughter-houses) under the control of the Metropolitan Board of Works, with a view to improved structural and sanitary arrangements, *Brown* 10432–10434. 10454–10457.

Approval of an inspection of the dairies, in conjunction with strict regulations as to movement, *Payne* 10496–10498.

5. *Disinfection:*

Twofold disinfection of the infected dairies in London, which are all under inspection; that is, in connection with the recent outbreak of cattle plague, *Payne* 9866, 9867.

6. *Proposed Quarantine of Dairy Cows from Abroad:*

Necessity of quarantining foreign milch cows, if admitted at all, *Rudkin* 9170–9172. 9211, 9212——Meeting held by the Metropolitan Dairymen's Society in March last, at which it was recommended that all live stock and milch cows from abroad should undergo a quarantine of fourteen days, *Tisdall* 9363, 9364.

7. *Conclusions of the Committee:*

Recommendation as regards store and dairy animals that they remain in quarantine for fourteen days, and afterwards be placed under inspection for two months, *Rep.* vi. ix.

Conclusion as to the prevalence of disease in the dairies in London and other large towns, *Rep.* viii——Evidence submitted to the Committee as to the feasibility of superseding town dairies by milk from the country, *ib.*

Opinion that in the metropolis and large towns dairy and cattle sheds should be subject to registration, inspection, and regulations as to movement; recommended legislation to this effect, *Rep.* viii, ix.

See also *Cows.* *Quarantine.*

Danneskiold-Samsoe, The Count C. F. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Represents the Agricultural Society of Denmark, 386, 387——Non-existence of cattle plague in Denmark since the year 1772; outbreak in Holstein in 1813 and 1814; 388-390——Visitation of pleuro-pneumonia in 1848, which was localised to the farm where it originated; sufficient precautions taken to prevent the spread of the disease, 391–393.

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Danneskiold-Samsoe, The Count, C. F. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

More frequent instances of foot-and-mouth disease in Denmark than of other cattle diseases; effectual means taken to stamp out this disease, 394-399——Statement that in consequence of the large outbreak in 1875 the Danish Government placed the disease under the same severe rules as pleuro-pneumonia, 396-399——Historical account of the laws and measures adopted in Denmark with reference to these diseases; preparation of a translation for the information of the Committee, 400–415.

Sheep-pox and sheep-scab subject in Denmark to the same rules as govern pleuro-pneumonia, 400, 401——Strict laws enforced as regards the exportation of cattle from Denmark; close examination of all cattle shipped for Great Britain, 416-426. 437-439——Information respecting the numbers of cattle and sheep exported from Denmark between 1866 and 1876; increase in the numbers exported to England, 427-436——Desire on the part of the Danish people to continue the export of cattle to England, 441, 442.

Impossibility of establishing a dead-meat trade with England; the chief difficulty would be the want of ice for preservation in hot weather, 443–447. 458-460. 463-469. 473-478——Precautions taken to disinfect empty vessels upon their return to Denmark, 448——Importation of cattle into Denmark chiefly from Sweden and England; that from Russia totally prohibited since 1869; 450–452. 455–457.

Custom in Denmark to kill the calves before the trade with England sprung up, 453, 454——Reasons for the increase of importation of cattle into England since 1870; 461, 462.

Opinion that it would entail a loss if the cattle exported from Denmark were obliged to be slaughtered at the port of landing in England, 466, 467. 488, 489——English ports to which cattle are shipped from Denmark at the present time; average time in transit, 470–472. 493.

Belief that if the export of live cattle from Denmark were stopped, the farmers would revert to the dairy system rather than enter into a dead-meat trade, 478——Information respecting the export of cattle from Denmark to Schleswig-Holstein, 479–487——Careful manner in which cattle are shipped and cared for on their passage to England, 490–494——Further information as regards the means used to stamp out the outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in 1875; 495–500.

Dead Meat:

1. *Evidence favourable to the Development of a large Dead-meat Trade between the Continent and England, Live Cattle being excluded; Prospects of successful Import throughout the Year.*
2. *Evidence at variance with the foregoing Conclusions.*
3. *Degree of Difficulty on the Score of Ice Supplies for Refrigeration.*
4. *Question of Introduction of Disease by means of Dead Meat.*
5. *Question of Competition with the Home Producer.*
6. *Amount of Import hitherto.*
7. *Means of Distribution from London throughout the Country.*
8. *Facilities of Conveyance from the Country to London; extensive Traffic already carried over the Great Western and other Railways.*
9. *Increased Purchases of Dead Meat by London Butchers.*
10. *Conclusions of the Committee.*

1. *Evidence favourable to the Development of a large Dead-meat Trade between the Continent and England, Live Cattle being excluded; Prospects of successful Import throughout the Year:*

Examination to the effect that a dead-meat supply may be obtained from abroad throughout the year, though in hot weather a considerable quantity has hitherto been condemned, *Brown* 348–375. 385——Great importance of developing the dead-meat trade; impossibility of dealing effectively with contagious diseases unless this trade very largely takes the place of the traffic in live animals, *ib.* 562–565. 693–698. 846–850——Argument that the trade in dead meat, as in all other articles of commerce, will find its own level, and be adopted where it pays; prospect of increase in the trade of live cattle be excluded, *ib.* 922–926. 979–983. 999–1005.

Favourable opinion of witness as to the probable success of the dead-meat trade; belief that this trade will eventually usurp the whole of the trade in cattle, *Booth* 2262–2264. 2292–2295. 2323–2326. 2361. 2423——Belief that if the importation of live cattle from the Continent were stopped, a sufficient supply of dead meat would come in its place, *Rea* 3689–3698. 3752–3758——In cold weather meat can be kept for a fortnight or so, and in hot weather for about a week, *Hamilton* 4329, 4330.

Contemplated import of dead meat from the Continent, as well as from America, in lieu of live stock, and in aid of the home supply; belief that a dead-meat supply from the Continent would speedily be forthcoming, and would be a profitable trade, *Sheldon* 4523–4531. 4675–4679——Belief that the proposed restrictions upon the import of foreign cattle

DEAD MEAT—continued.

1. *Evidence favourable to Development of a large Dead Meat Trade, &c.*—continued.

cattle would eventuate in a permanent dead-meat trade, and in a reduction of price to the consumer, *Sheldon* 4579–4588. 4615, 4616——Examination in further support of the conclusion that it would be more profitable to foreign exporters to send dead meat than live stock to this country, *ib.* 4617–4644.

Explanation that witness looks to a dead-meat supply as fully meeting the wants of the country, the import live stock being prohibited, *Wilson* 4733–4735——Great importance attached to the dead-meat trade, in the interests of the public, *ib.* 4868. 4873–4876——Prospect of an increased development of the dead-meat trade in substitution of live animals for daily slaughter, *ib.* 4871–4876. 4906–4912. 4921, 4922.

Further evidence in support of the conclusion that dead meat can be imported in full substitution for the live-cattle import, the import required being only about seven per cent. of the whole consumption, *Wilson* 4902–4917. 4921, 4922——Prospect of a dead-meat supply from the Continent as well as from America, *Wilson* 4921, 4922; *Gamgee* 7115–7117.

Contemplated import of dead meat from Vienna; belief that no serious difficulty would be experienced, *Burkett* 6215–6218. 6329–6332——Belief that regular and sufficient supplies of dead meat might be had in the absence of any import of live cattle, *ib.* 6246–6249. 6254—— Facility of bringing dead meat in good condition from the Continent, *ib.* 6383–6392——Belief that there would be a large and immediate dead-meat trade with the Continent if live cattle were excluded, *Stratton* 6881–6885.

Views expressed by witness in 1869 and 1873 as to the feasibility of a dead-meat trade from abroad by means of a refrigeration process; part taken by him in leading to the subsequent development of this trade, *Gamgee* 6951–6954. 6957. 6983. 7020–7022.

Very large dead-meat supply expected, not only from America but from the Continent, if live cattle be entirely excluded, *Gamgee* 6983–6992——Evidence in support of the conclusion that there is much more deterioration and waste in the transportation of live animals than of dead meat, *ib.* 7126–7135. 7137. 7216. 7221. 7228.

Advantage of a dead meat over a live cattle trade on the score of cost of transit, *Odams* 7975, 7976——Belief that commercial enterprise and science will soon develop a dead-meat trade throughout the country, *ib.* 7977, 7978. 7982, 7983. 8056, 8057——Facility of establishing cook stores or chambers in connection with a largely extended dead-meat trade, *ib.* 7993–8000.

Examination in approval of the dead-meat trade; belief that cattle are brought over in better condition dead than alive, *Howard* 8204–8210. 8306–8312. 8326–8329. 8381–8386. 8419, 8420——Advantage of the import of dead meat in lieu of live stock, *Smith* 8430. 8432–8435. 8459. 8463–8470——Successful conduct of a dead-meat trade by sea between Sydney and Melbourne several years ago, *Melvin* 8796–8802.

Belief that the establishment of a dead-meat supply would be an immense boon to the public, *Rudkin* 8968——Further statement as to the facilities and advantages of an extensive dead-meat trade, *ib.* 9177–9185——Opinion that a dead-meat trade is the safest and best, and that such trade will gradually increase so as to eventually supersede the import of live cattle, *Read* 9515, 9516.

Belief as to the facility of carrying on a permanent dead-meat trade, all foreign cattle being slaughtered at the ports, *Brown* 10018–10021, 10039, 10040——Necessity not only of ample slaughtering accommodation at the ports, but of approved arrangements for cooling the carcases, as in America, *ib.* 10250–10255.

2. *Evidence at Variance with the foregoing Conclusions:*

Grounds for the conclusion that a large and regular dead meat trade between the Continent and England cannot be successfully carried out, *Swan* 1666–1668. 1749–1753. 1796–1798; *Lyon* 3166–3183. 3271, 3272. 3292–3302. 3323–3335. 3358–3360. 3403–3418. 3443–3448——Comparison of value between shipments of live stock and shipments of carcases; larger price given by the butchers for live animals than for meat which is killed on the other side, *Swan* 1670–1672. 1637. 1755–1762. 1812–1814. 1824–1845. 1853–1858——Statement that home killed meat would keep better than imported dead meat, *ib.* 1873–1875.

Difficulties in the way of excluding the trade in dead meat, especially during the summer months, *Simonds* 1160–1166——Decided opinion that in the event of the importation of live cattle from Germany and Belgium being prohibited, it would not be possible for a dead meat trade to take the place of live import; grounds for this conclusion, *ib.* 1167–1170. 1245–1251. 1304–1313.

Impossibility of exporting dead meat from Germany into England on account of the cost of transit; inability to compete with America in this trade as regards cheapness of price, *Baron von Behr* 2472–2480. 2575–2577——Further statement that it would be

DEAD MEAT—continued.

2. *Evidence at Variance with the foregoing Conclusions*—continued.

impossible to send dead meat from Germany to England even if it were wholly packed in ice, *Baron von Behr* 2588–2590.

Assertion that Continental meat, though fetching in the London market 8 *d.* a pound alive, would not fetch as much as 6½ *d.* a pound as dead meat, *Lyon* 3294–3301——Necessity for killing the Continental cattle immediately upon their arrival, and selling the meat quickly, as otherwise it loses its bloom and is depreciated in value, *ib.* 3473–3475——Very large increase necessary in the importation of dead meat into London before it would make up for the loss of live import, *ib.* 3481–3483——Obstacles to the dead meat supply becoming a permanent trade and competing with the trade in live animals killed in this country, *Lambert*, 3861.

Grounds for the conclusion that it would never pay to send dead meat from the Continent to England, the import of live cattle being prohibited, *Gebhardt*, 5202–5212——Belief that a dead meat supply in lieu of the foreign live cattle supply is not practicable; great uncertainty of a dead meat trade, the market being sometimes glutted and prices most uncertain, *ib.* 5248. 5251. 5414–5433. 5570–5572. 5589——Question whether dead meat could not be brought from St. Petersburg and other Russian ports at a profit, *ib.* 5480–5482.

Belief further expressed that a dead meat supply from the Continent could not be calculated upon in lieu of the live animal supply, *Gebhardt* 5514–5516. 5617–5623——Grounds for dissenting from the view that it would be feasible so to regulate a dead meat trade as to prevent a glut in the market at some times and a scarcity at other times, *ib.* 5609 5616. 5730, 5731——Smaller size of Continental than American beasts, so that it would be more difficult to send the former in good condition as dead meat, *ib.* 5618. 5620——Less price to be realised by dead meat from the Continent than from America, *ib.* 5621–5624——Full approval of the import of dead meat as one means of supply, *ib.* 5716.

Opinion that a dead meat trade exclusively would not suit the wants of the retail butchers; reference hereon to the extent of purchases in the Metropolitan Dead Meat Market, *Pool* 5884–5895——Examination as to the relative loss or deterioration in the case of dead meat cargoes and of live cattle cargoes, *ib.* 5960–5970. 6022. 6045–6049——Probable gluts in the market if supplied entirely by foreign dead meat; impractibility of regulating the supply, *ib.* 6080, 6081. 6100–6104.

Undue stringency by requiring the slaughter of foreign animals at the port of embarkation, with a view to a dead meat supply exclusively, *Robinson* 8567——Obstacles to the successful conduct of a large dead meat trade from the Continent throughout the year, *ib.* 8707–8710.

3. *Degree of Difficulty on the Score of Ice Supplies for Refrigeration:*

Obstacle on the score of ice supply, as well as on other grounds, to a large dead meat trade between the Continent and England, *Swan* 1636–1668. 1749–1753; *Lyon*, 3166 *et seq.*——Expected removal of the difficulty as regards ice supplies on the Continent, *Sheldon* 4629–4632.

Facility of artificially producing ice in sufficient quantities for refrigeration of meat as well as of milk; limited expense involved, *Wilson* 5036–5038. 5061–5068. 5074——Belief that ice can be manufactured at the same cost per ton as the cost of coals per ton, *ib.* 5036. 5038.

Difficulty as to supplies of ice for refrigerating meat from the Continent, *Gebhardt* 5203–5206. 5618. 5620. 5717–5720. 5726–5729; *Pool* 5981–5987——Facility of artificially producing ice on board dead meat ships, *Gamgee* 7197–7199.

4. *Question of Introduction of Disease by means of Dead Meat:*

Doubt whether the importation of dead meat need be prohibited from countries from which the importation of live animals is stopped, *Simonds* 1195–1198——Disapproval of slaughter at the port of embarkation; belief that such a system would not give effectual security, as it is quite possible for cattle plague to be introduced by dead meat, *ib.* 1235–1238. 1319–1325——Very great risk of importing partially diseased meat into England, if the importation of live stock be prohibited, *Hall* 2989, 2990.

Improbability of disease being imported by means of dead meat, *Rea* 3680–3682. 3738–3744; *Wilson* 4991, 4992——Doubt as to diseased dead meat being capable of spreading disease, *Gebhardt* 5198–5201.

Greater difficulty in detecting disease in dead meat than in the live animal, *Luya* 7552–7554——Opinion that dead meat may be safely imported from countries where there is cattle plague, *Read* 9651, 9652——Grounds for the opinion that dead meat as well as live animals should be excluded from any country where there is cattle plague, *Brown* 10022–10024.

5. *Question*

DEAD MEAT—continued.

5. *Question of Competition with the Home Producer:*

Readiness of witness to face the competition of a dead-meat import, if it will free him from the risk of disease, *Wilson* 5002–5012. 5078, 5079.

Effect of an extensive dead-meat trade in ruining the home trade; injury especially to the British farmer if the London market were no longer open to him, *Gebhardt* 5418–5420. 5430–5433. 5685–5695.

6. *Amount of Import hitherto:*

Number of beasts represented by the import of dead meat into London; effect thereof in keeping down the price of meat, *Gebhardt* 5469–5472 ——Considerable supplies of dead meat from Denmark and Tonning; facility in transmission, without any refrigerating process, *Burkett* 6219–6226——Decided tendency to an increase of the dead-meat trade, the chief difficulty being when the weather is hot, *Giblett* 6736–6738.

Activity in the foreign dead-meat trade during the restrictions upon import in 1865, *Gamgee* 6986——Limited extent to which the dead-meat import took the place of the live-cattle import, when the latter was restricted in 1865, *ib.* 7040–7042.

The import of dead meat from the Continent practically ceases from April to the end of September, *Robinson* 8710.

7. *Means of Distribution from London throughout the Country:*

Advantage in being able to distribute foreign live cattle throughout the country, the distribution of dead meat not being feasible, as it will not keep, *Swan* 1763–1768; *Gebhardt* 5414–5417. 5429. 5671–5673——Explanation as to a great deal of comparatively inferior meat going from London into the country; effect of the dead-meat supply on this score, *Gebhardt* 5494, 5495. 5648–5654——Further statement as to the difficulties in sending dead meat throughout the year from London into the country, *ib.* 5581–5587. 5655–5657.

Facility in the distribution of dead meat from Deptford throughout the country; advantage on this score of direct railway communication with the market, *Sir C. A. Wood* 7434, 7435; *Odams* 7971–7974. 8000; *Howard* 8274–8278; *Robinson* 8602–8604; *Rudkin* 8972–8975. 9040–9042. 9106–9108. 9133–9136——Advantage if fat cattle were not moved into the country, save in the form of dead meat, *Read* 9743–9747.

8. *Facilities of Conveyance from the Country to London; Extensive Traffic already carried over the Great Western and other Railways:*

Result of witness' experience that arrangements may readily be made for the successful conveyance of dead meat in very large quantities by railway from the country to London and other towns, and *vice versâ;* considerable quantity now conveyed over the Great Western Railway, *Sir C. A. Wood* 7360–7381. 7383–7392——Special dead-meat vans being constructed for use on the Great Western line; good prospect of their success in the hottest weather, *ib.* 7363–7368. 7376–7378.

Information relative to the large fish trade from Kinsale over the Great Western Railway, and the rates charged; conclusion that dead meat may be carried with equal success, *Sir C. A. Wood* 7383–7392; *App.* 571–575——Better rates for the conveyance of dead meat than live stock, *Sir C. A. Wood* 7471——Increasing dead-meat trade from the West of England to London, *ib.* 7486.

Great advantage of animals being slaughtered where they are fed; superiority of country-killed meat to that killed in London, whilst under the former plan there is a saving of some five per cent. in absolute weight, *Rudkin* 8968–8971. 9046–9049. 9056. 9175, 9176. 9186——Gradual diminution of the live-cattle supply to London, and gradual increase of the dead-meat supply, *ib.* 9031–9035. 9119–9122. 9159–9161——Large supplies of dead meat received from Scotland, the West of England, and Ireland, even in the hottest weather, *ib.* 9032–9034. 9159, 9160. 9180–9182.

Denial that there is any loss of weight through cattle being sent from the country for slaughter in London, *Knowles* 9299.

Successful transmission of large quantities of dead meat from Norfolk to London in hot as well as cold weather, *Read* 9561–9566.

9. *Increased Purchases of Dead Meat by London Butchers:*

Large extent to which the dead meat trade in London has grown since it was first established, *Brown* 967–972——Practice of some butchers as to daily purchases of dead of dead meat; advantage taken by them of a glut in the market, *Burkett* 6177–6181——Increasing purchases of dead meat in the central market, many butchers having given up slaughtering and relying less upon live animals, *ib.* 6181–6194. 6313–6315. 6335–6337.

Report, 1877—*continued.*

DEAD MEAT—continued.

10. *Conclusions of the Committee:*

Conclusion adverse to the proposal for requiring all foreign cattle to be slaughtered abroad, so that dead meat, exclusively, should be imported, *Rep.* vi——Weight of evidence adverse to the proposal for requiring the slaughter of foreign cattle at the port of embarkation, *ib.*

Grounds upon which the Committee conclude that an extensive dead meat trade throughout the country would result from compulsory slaughter at the port of debarkation, *Rep.* vii.

See also *Aberdeenshire. American Dead Meat. Australia. Denmark*, 4. *Deptford Market*, 9. *Foreign Cattle*, II., IV. *Free Trade. Freights. Germany*, 9. *Glasgow. Holland*, 3. *Home Supply. Hull. Ireland, &c.*, 12. *Leeds. Offal. Refrigeration. Sheep. South America. Tallerman, Mr.*

DENMARK:

1. *Extent to which Cattle Plague, Pleuro-pneumonia, and Foot-and-Mouth Disease have existed in Denmark; Preventive Measures taken by Government.*
2. *Export of Cattle to Great Britain and other Countries; Precautions against Disease.*
3. *Question of requiring the Slaughter of Cattle from Denmark at the Port of Arrival in England.*
4. *Question of a Dead Meat Import from Denmark.*

1. *Extent to which Cattle Plague, Pleuro-pneumonia, and Foot-and-Mouth Disease have existed in Denmark; Preventive Measures taken by Government:*

Non-existence of cattle plague in Denmark since the year 1772; outbreak in Holstien in 1813 and 1814; *Count Danneskiold-Samsoe* 388–390——Visitation of pleuro-pneumonia in 1848 which was localised to the farm where it originated; sufficient precautions taken to prevent the spread of the disease, *ib.* 391–393. 415——More frequent instances of foot-and-mouth disease in Denmark than of other cattle diseases; effectual means taken to stamp out this disease, *ib.* 394–399.

Statements that in consequence of the large outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in 1875 the Danish Government placed the disease under the same severe rules as pleuro-pneumonia, *Count Danneskiold-Samsoe* 396–399——Historical account of the laws and measures adopted in Denmark with reference to these diseases; preparation of a translation for the information of the Committee, *ib.* 400–415——Sheep-pox and sheep-scab subject to the same rules as govern pleuro-pneumonia, *ib.* 400, 401——Importation of cattle into Denmark chiefly from Sweden and England; that from Russia totally prohibited since 1869, *ib.* 450–452. 455–457——Further information as regards the means used to stamp out the outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in 1875, *ib.* 495–500.

Existence of pleuro-pneumonia in Denmark in recent years, whilst in former times cattle plague came to this country from Denmark, *Gamgee* 6998–7002.

Government Order, dated 29th December 1857, laying down instructions as to the steps to be taken in cases of contagious diseases of different kinds, *App.* 503–505.

General Order, under date 20th September 1858, for the treatment of infectious diseases in domestic animals, *App.* 505, 506——Regulations to be observed with regard to pleuro-pneumonia (as laid down in Decree of 28th September 1858), *ib.* 506, 507.

Decree, dated 10th April 1875, concerning foot-and-mouth disease, *App.* 507——Regulations, issued 16th October 1875, with further reference to the steps to be taken as regards foot-and-mouth disease, *ib.*

Order, dated 16th January 1877, laying down the measures to be adopted against importation of cattle plague from Germany, *App.* 508.

Circular issued to the prefects, dated 10th February 1877, in view of an eventual importation of cattle plague, *App.* 509.

2. *Export of Cattle to Great Britain and other Countries; Precautions against Disease:*

Strict laws enforced as regards the exportation of cattle from Denmark; close examination of all cattle shipped for Great Britain, *Count Danneskiold-Samsoe* 416–426. 437–439——Information respecting the numbers of cattle and sheep exported from Denmark between 1866 and 1876; increase in the numbers exported to England, *ib.* 427–436——Desire on the part of the Danish people to continue the export of cattle to England, *ib.* 441, 442.

Precautions

Report, 1877—*continued.*

DENMARK—continued.

2. *Export of Cattle to Great Britain and other Countries, &c.*—continued.

Precautions taken to disinfect empty vessels upon their return to Denmark, *Count Danneskiold-Samsoe* 448——Custom in Denmark to kill the calves before the trade with England sprung up, *ib.* 453, 454——Reasons for the increase of importation of cattle into England from Denmark since 1870, *ib.* 461, 462.

English ports to which cattle are shipped from Denmark at the present time; average time in transit, *Count Danneskiold-Samsoe*, 470–472. 493——Information respecting the export of cattle from Denmark to Schleswig-Holstein, *ib.* 479–487——Careful manner in which cattle are shipped and cared for on their passage to England, *ib.* 490–494.

Statement as to the proportion of store cattle imported into England from Denmark, Sweden, and Norway; large number of cattle introduced from Denmark for dairy purposes, *Swan* 1673–1682. 1740–1747——General freedom from disease in regard to the cattle imported from Denmark, *ib.* 1748——Increase lately in the import from Denmark to Glasgow, *Hamilton*, 4205, 4206.

Import of a cargo of cattle from Denmark with foot-and-mouth disease, whereas that country is said to be free from the disease, *Gebhardt* 5451–5455.

Order, dated 26th February 1876, concerning the measures to be adopted with regard to export of domestic animals to Great Britain, *App.* 508, 509——Authority given to Government in February 1876 for preventing the export of diseased animals, *ib.* 508.

Return showing the export of cattle and of sheep and lambs to Great Britain and to Schleswig and Holstein in each of the years 1866–76, *App.* 509.

3. *Question of requiring the Slaughter of Cattle from Denmark at the Port of Arrival in England:*

Opinion that it would entail a loss if the cattle exported from Denmark were obliged to be slaughtered at the port of landing in England, *Count Danneskiold-Samsoe* 466, 467. 488, 489——Belief that if the export of live cattle from Denmark were stopped, the farmers would revert to the dairy system rather than enter into a dead meat trade, *ib.* 478.

Proposed exception in the case of Denmark as regards prohibition with reference to pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease, *Wilson* 4977. 5086——Objection to import from Denmark, notwithstanding the precautions in that country against disease, *Gamgee* 7150–7155——Opinion that cattle from Denmark should be slaughtered at the port of debarkation, although that country is pretty free from disease, *Robinson* 8582–8585; *Rudkin* 9085. 9164.

4. *Question of a Dead Meat Import from Denmark:*

Impossibility of establishing a dead meat trade with England; the chief difficulty would be the want of ice for refrigeration in hot weather, *Count Danneskiold-Samsoe*, 443–447. 458–460. 463–469. 473–478.

Inferior character of the dead meat imported from Denmark; unsatisfactory condition in which it sometimes arrives, *Burkett*, 6353–6359.

DEPTFORD MARKET:

1. *Number of Animals sent to the Market.*
2. *Effect of the Restrictions as to Slaughter upon the Supply and upon Prices.*
3. *Increased and Regular Supply and better Competition if all Foreign Cattle coming to London were Slaughtered at Deptford.*
4. *Exceptions taken to the foregoing Proposal.*
5. *Provision of Slaughter-houses.*
6. *Sanitary Condition.*
7. *Inconvenience in Deptford and Islington Markets being held on the same Day.*
8. *Corporation Charges.*
9. *Arrangements for the Distribution of Dead Meat from the Market; Advantage of Direct Railway Communication.*
10. *Mode of treating the Carcases of Diseased Animals.*

1. *Number of Animals sent to the Market:*

Statement of the number of cattle, calves, sheep, and pigs that have come to Deptford Market in the first six months of 1877; large decrease of cattle owing to the restrictions upon import from Germany, whilst there has been an enormous increase of sheep, *Rudkin*, 8931–8935——Gradual increase since 1871 in the number of animals sent to Deptford, *ib.* 9050–9054——Doubt as to any English cattle going to Deptford, *ib.* 9208, 9209.

Report, 1877—*continued.*

DEPTFORD MARKET—continued.

2. *Effect of the Restrictions as to Slaughter upon the Supply and upon Prices:*

Objection of those interested in the cattle trade in Holland to the limited trade at Deptford as compared with the larger market at Islington, *May* 2051, 2052——Examination in regard to the loss experienced by sending cattle to Deptford Market; grounds for the opinion that many buyers avoid Deptford, *Lyon* 3485-3495. 3498-3501. 3558, 3559. 3564, 3565.

Necessity of slaughtering at Deptford all the forrign cattle coming to London; belief that they must be slaughtered within ten days, *Gebhardt* 5540-5543. 5610——Several respects in which compulsory slaughter at Deptford tends to restrict the trade and to lessen the import, *ib.* 5544-5551. 5589. 5594-5601——Probability of an increased number of buyers at Deptford if all the cattle coming into London went there to be slaughtered, *ib.* 5597-5601.

Considerable falling off in the supply of foreign animals at the Deptford Market, the present supply from Holland and France being very small, *Pool* 5790-5813——Very few buyers and very little competition at Deptford, the retail butchers not having slaughter-houses there; prejudicial effect as regards the supply from abroad, *ib.* 5791. 5796-5805. 6072-6077——Conclusion that Deptford Market should be abolished altogether, *ib.* 6008, 6009. 6072-6077.

Way in which compulsory slaughter at Deptford has a very deterrent effect upon foreign import; great dislike of buyers to attend the market, *Giblett* 6627-6635. 6733-6735.

Doubt as to their being much difference between the prices at Deptford Market and at the Metropolitan Market; disadvantage of the former in not having direct railway communication, *Odams* 7965-7970. 7973, 7974. 8033. 8095-8102——Dissent from certain statements as to the loss incurred by sending cattle to Deptford to be slaughtered. *Robinson* 8585. 8604. 8639——Prejudice to the market through the practical exclusion of Government contractors, *ib.* 8659——Inaccuracy of certain evidence as to the prices at Deptford being much lower than at Islington, *Rudkin* 8960-8966. 9030.

Uncertainty of the supply to Deptford Market, and paucity of buyers, under the existing regulations, *Rep.* vii.

3. *Increased and Regular Supply and better Competition if all Foreign Cattle coming to London were Slaughtered at Deptford:*

Regularity of supply and increase of competition at Deptford if there were improved accommodation and if all foreign cattle were slaughtered on landing, *Odams* 7967-7970. 8016——Evidence as to the want of improved arrangements in connection with the market, *ib.* 7971-7974. 8095-8102.

Advantage of all foreign cattle being slaughtered at Deptford, and of direct railway communication with the market, *Howard* 8274-8278——Regular and ample supply at Deptford if there were compulsory slaughter of all foreign animals landed in the port of London; disadvantages of the present uncertainty of supply in the market, *Robinson* 8579. 8586-8590. 8604-8606. 8626, 8627. 8649-8654. 8715, 8716.

Great detriment to trade, and to the usefulness of Deptford Market, by the uncertainty of the regulations as to the import and slaughtering of foreign cattle, *Rudkin* 8955-8957. 9085-9091——Stability of trade at Deptford and abundance of competition, if there were a permanent and compulsory system of slaughtering at the port, *ib.* 8959, 8960. 8967, 8968. 9086-9091. 9146-9148. 9210——Advantage of a separate market at Deptford for all foreign stock, *Read* 9522-9524. 9530-9532.

Considerable improvement expected by the Committee under a system of compulsory slaughter at the port, *Rep.* vii.

4. *Exceptions taken to the foregoing Proposal:*

Greatly diminished supply if all foreign cattle coming in future to London had to be slaughtered at Deptford, *Thomsen* 2170-2174——Evidence strongly opposed to a permanent system whereby all foreign cattle should be obliged to go to Deptford for slaughter; great injury thereby to foreign exporters, who would, in fact, shun the market as much as possible, *Gebhardt* 5483-5493——Decided objection to an extended system of compulsory slaughter at Deptford, *Pool* 5838, 5839. 6001-6009. 6039-6044. 6072-6081.

5. *Provision of Slaughter-houses:*

Greater expense in slaughtering at Deptford than on the butchers' premises, *Gebhardt* 5519, 5520. 5547——Increase of slaughter-houses at Deptford and increasing practice of butchers to buy dead meat instead of slaughtering at home, *Robinson* 8588, 8589. 8652-8654.

Increased supply of slaughter-houses at Deptford if slaughtering of all foreign cattle were compulsory, *Rudkin* 9137. 9165——Advantage in an increased use of slaughter-houses

at

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Deptford Market—continued.

Provision of Slaughter-houses—continued.

at Deptford by retail butchers throughout London; decided tendency in this direction, *Rudkin* 9165–9168. 9177-9179——Uncertainty of the supply at Deptford; a very large business is, however, transacted and more slaughter-houses are being built, *Read* 9523, 9524.

6. *Sanitary Condition:*

Exceedingly objectionable character of Deptford Market; the smells are abominable, and moreover witness hates covered markets, *Giblett* 6585–6587. 6633–6635. 6702. 6734, 6735.

Witness submits that the sanitary condition of the market is as good as is practicable; exceedingly offensive smell, however, from the carbolic acid used in disinfection, *Rudkin* 8942–8946.

7. *Inconvenience in Deptford and Islington Markets being held on the same Day:*

Considerable inconvenience to salesmen and buyers through the markets being held on the same day at Deptford and Islington, *Giblett* 6770-6773; *Read* 9523.

8. *Corporation Charges:*

Comment upon the heavy rent charged by the Corporation for the market, and upon the charge of 5*s.* for each bullock landed, *Odams* 8103-8108.

Explanation relative to the much higher charges of the Corporation for each bullock, sheep, and calf in Deptford Market than at Islington, *Rudkin* 9055–9074. 9080-9083——Statement showing that the importer has to pay quite as much to get his beast to Islington Market as to Deptford, *ib.* 9068. 9075–9079.

9. *Arrangements for the Distribution of Dead Meat from the Market: Advantage of direct Railway Communication:*

Great convenience in the distribution of dead meat from Deptford Market if the railway were extended directly into the market, *Sir C. A. Wood* 7434, 7435; *Howard* 8274-8278——Increased dead-meat trade from Deptford to the provinces if there were direct railway communication, *Odams* 7971–7974. 8000—— Facility in the transmission of dead meat to the provinces, *Robinson* 8602–8604——Improvement much required in the mode of carting dead meat from Deptford, *ib.* 8699.

Facility in carrying on a large dead-meat trade between Deptford and the country; very large number of sheep carcases sent from Deptford to Wales and other distant parts, some of which came back again to London, *Rudkin* 8972-8975. 9133–9135. 9138, 9139. 9158. 9162——Facility, also, in providing direct railway accommodation with the market, *ib.* 9040-9042. 9106–9108. 9136.

10. *Mode of treating the Carcases of Diseased Animals:*

Particulars as to the course pursued at Deptford in getting rid of 39 cases of diseased animals in the present year; prompt action taken whilst disinfection was carefully carried out, *Rudkin* 8947–8954——Provision of a "digester" in each of the four compartments of the market, each digester being capable of boiling down eight carcases at one process, *ib.* 8948——Impossibility of disposing of the carcases by burying them under the market; advantage if there were an available space for the purpose outside the market, *ib.* 8950, 8951. *See* also *Cattle Plague*, 4. *France.*

Disease, Origin and Extent of. See *Cattle Plague. Dairies and Cowsheds. Foot-and-mouth Disease. Foreign Cattle. Germany. Holland. Ireland and Irish Cattle. Pleuro-pneumonia. Russia, Spain, and Portugal.*

Disinfection. Considerable difficulty experienced by local authorities in enforcing the order as to the disinfection of persons who have been in connection with diseased animals; inability of the local authorities to carry out these and like arrangements with the present limited staff, *Brown* 143–153——Directions given to the inspector to prevent any persons leaving infected premises unless they submit to a process of disinfection; instance of a person who refused to submit to this process, and who is being prosecuted by the Treasury, *ib.* 173–177.

Regulations laid down in the Animals Order of 1875 as to the cleansing and disinfection of cattle ships, railway trucks, &c., *App.* 523, 524.

See also *Cattle Ships. Dairies, &c.* 5.

Dublin. Considerable improvement in the arrangements in Dublin for the shipment of cattle, *Sir C. A. Wood* 7400. 7445.

Dutch Cows. See *Cows. Dairies and Cowsheds. Holland.*

Report, 1877—*continued.*

E.

Edinburgh. Considerable increase in the supply of cattle used in Edinburgh since 1866; *Swan* 1642—— Material increase in the import from Denmark during the same period, *ib.*——Increase of prices concurrently with the introduction of a larger supply of cattle, *ib.* 1643, 1644.

Entry upon Premises. Expediency of giving to the local authorities the power of entry into premises where the disease is suspected to exist, *Brown* 619, 620——Considerable difficulty in some cases as to the inspectors' entry upon premises; instructions issued to them in consequence, *ib.* 10292–10297.

Export of Cattle. Witness has occasionally taken prize cattle to America, the freight being from 15 *l.* to 20 *l.* for each animal, *Whitwell* 1939–1941——Diseases in this country which induce foreign countries to prohibit the importation of our cattle, *Booth* 2455–2458.

Large numbers of English cattle purchased for breeding purposes in Germany, *Baron von Behr* 2537, 2538. 2578–2584——Decided opinion that the loss which the prohibition of imports from England would cause to Germany would not be a tenth part of the loss suffered from a prohibition of the export from Germany to England, *ib.* 2581–2584.

Effect of the prevalence of contagious diseases in this country in preventing export of English stock, though much wanted abroad for improving the breed of foreign stock, *Stratton* 6820–6822. 6829–6833.

See also *Australia.*

F.

Fairs and Markets. Absence of pleuro-pneumonia on witness' farm on account of his keeping away from the markets when that disease was prevalent, *Rea* 3589–3591—— Opinion that where foot-and-mouth disease is prevalent in any district the fairs and markets should be closed; approval of compulsory orders from the Privy Council on this subject throughout the kingdom, *ib.* 3650–3654. 3662, 3663. 3798.

Advantage of markets specially for Irish stock after arrival in England, *Sir C. A. Wood* 7426. 7472, 7473—— Introduction of foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia through fairs, *Howard* 8153–8155——Separate markets advisable for home and foreign cattle sent to London, *ib.* 8273–8275.

Advantage of separate markets for fat stock and lean stock; reference more especially to lean stock from Ireland, *Melvin* 8911–8916——Expediency of a distinct separation between store markets and fat-stock markets, *Tisdall* 9404, 9405.

Suggestions as to the restrictions to be imposed as regards fairs and markets, &c., *Read* 9671–9679: *Brown* 10056–10058. 10080. 10101, 10102. 10248——Frequent presence of foot-and-mouth disease in Islington Market and in fairs and markets generally, *Brown* 10004–10006.

Restriction in force in the metropolis (6th July 1877), but not in the country, as regards fairs and markets, *Peel* 9868, 9869.

Orders of Council in January 1877, and subsequently, placing various restrictions upon the movement of cattle and upon the holding of fairs and market, *App.* 544 *et seq.*

Action taken by various local authorities in closing markets, &c. in their districts, *App.* 561.

Conclusion of the Committee as to the restrictions necessary in regard to fairs and markets, if certain restrictions be imposed on the foreign trade, *Rep.* v, ix, x. *See* also *Movement of Cattle.*

Farmers:

Opinion that the stock owners in England would not comply with the stringent regulations necessary in order to get rid of foot-and-mouth disease, *Brown* 651–665—— Stringent regulations absolutely necessary if cattle diseases are to be extirpated in England; belief that such regulations would not be submitted to by the people of this country, *Simonds* 1158, 1159. 1216, 1217. 1252–1257. 1266–1274. 1297–1299.

Willingness of witness and of farmers generally in Yorkshire to submit to severe restrictions in order to stamp out pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease, *Booth* 2314. 2340. 2363. 2411–2413. 2418, 2419. 2421, 2422. 2462——Opinion that the farmers throughout the country would be quite willing to submit to any restrictions having the object of stamping out disease effectually; readiness to submit even to such stringent regulations as were in force in regard to the cattle plague, *ib.* 3599–3601. 3637–3642. 3686, 3687. 3716–3724. 3731. 3745. 3789.

Readiness

Report, 1877—*continued.*

FARMERS—continued.

Readiness of farmers to submit to stringent restrictions, if thereby foot-and-mouth disease can be permanently stamped out, *Sheldon* 4538–4540. 4613, 4614——Expected willingness of farmers to conform to the proposed restrictions upon movements, if these are enforced through the Privy Council, *Wilson* 4772–4781——Willingness of witness to be confined to a dead-meat trade, if it were necessary in his case for preventing the spread of disease, as by means of foreign import, *ib.* 5002–5012. 5078, 5079——Entire readiness of the farmers in Gloucestershire to conform to stringent regulations for stamping out foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia, *Lord Fitzhardinge* 5277–5281. 5285. 5314, 5315.

Grounds for the conclusion that there is a very general unanimity among farmers in favour of more stringent regulations as regards the home trade, *Stratton* 6789, 6790. 6810, 6811. 6823–6825. 6911-6916. 6933, 6934——Arbitrary and unequal restrictions enforced when the cattle plague first appeared, so that the farmers naturally complained, *ib.* 6888–6892.

Readiness of farmers in Yorkshire to submit to severe restrictions for the stamping out of cattle plague, *Soulby* 7270–7272——Opinion that in Yorkshire the farmers would object to a general prohibition upon movement, or to the stoppage of fairs and markets for a year, as a means towards the suppression of pleuro-pneumonia, *ib.* 7276–7284. 7293. 7320, 7321.

Entire willingness of farmers to submit to almost any restrictions, in order that losses from disease may be prevented; good grounds of witness for this statement, *Odams* 7957–7964. 8058–8066——Opinion of witness, as representing the Farmers' Club, that farmers would submit to more stringent regulations for the suppression of disease, but that it would soon be re-introduced unless foreign cattle were excluded, *Howard* 8188–8190. 8197–8199. 8398–8400.

Statement as to the willingness of the farmers in Scotland to conform to very stringent regulations at home, in conjunction with a system of slaughtering of foreign cattle at the port of debarkation, *Melvin* 8821–8829——Entire readiness of dairymen and farmers to submit to stringent regulations as regards inspection and movement of cattle, so that they may be secured against disease, *Tisdall* 9396–9400. 9406. 9424–9426——Result of witness' experience that the farmers of England would readily conform to the restriction necessary for stamping out disease, *Read* 9604–9607. 9626. 9679.

Very severe restrictions necessary in order to stamp out pleuro-pneumonia throughout the country; belief that farmers would not willingly undergo the great inconvenience involved, *Brown* 9901–9905.

Further argument that the severe home restrictions required for stamping out pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease would not be submitted by farmers without very strong opposition, *Brown* 9986–9988. 10070–10074. 10081, 10082——Difficulty experienced in applying the cattle plague restrictions in 1875, *ib.* 10070–10074. 10081.

Witness repeats that the farmers would probably throw great difficulties in the way of severe restrictions in Lincolnshire, *Brown* 10091. 10096, 10097. 10103, 10104——Large preponderance of evidence before the Committee, to the effect that farmers generally would readily conform to the necessary restrictions on movement, &c., *Rep.* v, vi.

See also *Central Chamber of Agriculture.* *Compensation.* *Home Supply.* *Loss from Disease.* *Scotland.*

Farmers' Club. Views of witness, as representing the Farmers' Club, in favour of all fat cattle being slaughtered at the port of entry, *Howard* 8200, 8201. 8251–8255. 8269, 8270. 8313–8325. 8405–8410——Suggestions, on behalf of the Farmers' Club, as to the regulations and restrictions desirable as regards both the home and foreign trade, *ib.* 8211 *et seq.*

Views of the Privy Council authorities in reference to the measures advocated in memorial from the Central Chamber of Agriculture and the Farmers' Club, *App.* 566, 567.

Fitzhardinge, The Right Honourable Francis William, Baron. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Explanation in connection with an order passed a few months ago by the quarter sessions in Gloucestershire, on the motion of witness, prohibiting the import of Irish cattle into the county, 5256–5263. 5327–5337. 5340–5343——Great want of an efficient Government inspection at places in the Severn, other than Bristol, where cattle, sheep, and pigs are landed from Irish boats; particular instances in illustration, 5260–5276. 5294–5313. 5338, 5339. 5344——Instance of a cargo of Irish cattle landed several miles above Bristol, without inspection, 5261–5264. 5296–5300.

Statement as to the Government inspectors at Bristol having nothing to do with sheep or pigs, whilst the local inspector does not inspect on landing and is paid only by half the fines when disease is detected in the market, 5263–5268. 5289–5293——Extensive

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Fitzhardinge, The Right Hon. Francis William, Baron. (Analysis, &c.)—*continued.*

dairy district between Gloucester and Bristol, heavy losses being sustained by the farmers from foot-and-mouth disease imported by Irish cattle, 5271–5274. 5287, 5288.

Willingness of the farmers in Gloucestershire to conform to stringent regulations for stamping out disease, 5277–5281. 5285. 5314, 5315——Reluctance of farmers to buy pigs for fattening through fear of foot-and-mouth disease, 5281–5284——Bad condition of some sheep and pigs recently landed at Bristol from Ireland, 5294, 5295. 5322–5326.

Foot-and-Mouth Disease:

1. *Origin of the Disease in this Country; its Infectious Character.*
2. *Extensive Import of Diseased Animals.*
3. *Losses from the Disease.*
4. *Suggestions as to the Restrictions to be enforced; Good Effect of the Cattle Plague Regulations.*
5. *Orders of the Privy Council.*
6. *Amount of Disease at the present Time.*
7. *Conclusions of the Committee.*

1. *Origin of the Disease in this Country; its Infectious Character:*

Conclusion that foot-and-mouth disease is not generally conveyed by means of mediate contagion, and that it is less infectious than cattle plague; the prevalence of this disease throughout the country is principally owing to the indiscriminate movement of diseased and infected animals, *Brown* 43–48. 913–921. 10083, 10084——Evidence at variance with the view that the continued importation of foreign animals is the cause of the introduction of foot-and-mouth disease, *ib.* 291, 292. 303–308. 507, 508. 548. 555——Existence of the disease in this country previously to foreign import, *ib.* 290, 291——Decided opinion that the disease is naturalised in this country, and would continue without aid of foreign supply, *ib.* 945, 946.

Possibility of the foot-and-mouth disease having been originally introduced by means of surplus ships' stores; conclusion that it was not spontaneously generated in this country, *Simonds* 1116–1119——Belief that the disease is atmospherical, and may be generated in this country, *Swan* 1773–1779.

Undoubted opinion that the foot-and-mouth disease was introduced into witness' herd by means of strange cattle having been driven along roads passing through his farm, *Booth* 2246–2248. 2313——Belief that the disease is foreign, though it has to some extent become acclimatised in England, *Booth* 2381–2385. 2420; *Sheldon* 4541–4563.

Contagious character of foot-and-mouth disease, *Hamilton* 4265, 4266——Witness submits that the disease is the direct result of cruelty and ill-usage, more especially on board the Irish boats, *ib.* 4273. 4280–4303. 4346–4351.

Doubt as to the disease originating otherwise than by contagion, *Wilson* 4984–4989——Witness contends that pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease are home diseases and are not imported, *Gebhardt* 5172–5178. 5674. 5677. 5713–5715——Consideration of exceptions taken to witness' view that foot-and-mouth disease occurs in this country, irrespectively of foreign import, *ib.* 5552–5561.

Conviction of witness that foot-and-mouth disease is atmospheric, *Pool* 5951, 5952. 6041——Prevalence of foot-and-mouth disease in England long before any foreign cattle were imported, *Giblett* 6567. 6576, 6577. 6698–6700——Witness submits that the disease is as much native as foreign, and that animals do not die from it, *ib.* 6719, 6720. 6727, 6728——Belief that the disease can only be conveyed by contagion, and that it was first introduced into England from abroad, *Stratton* 6816–6819. 6845–6849. 6862–6864. 6927–6932; *Howard* 8191–8196. 8411–8413.

Peculiarly contagious and infectious character of foot-and-mouth disease, the import of one or two diseased animals contaminating very large numbers, *Gamgee* 6959–6965——Witness contends that the disease was first introduced from abroad, although this conclusion may be at variance with the reports of the Veterinary Department of the Privy Council, *ib.* 7169–7173. 7208–7215. 7227——The disease was first called the epidemic; that is, in 1840–41, *ib.* 7172——Explanation as to the continuance of the disease in Ireland, though foreign cattle are not imported, *ib.* 7177–7180.

Witness is positive the disease does not arise spontaneously, *Read* 9619, 9620. 9664, 9665——Impression as to the disease being communicable to human beings, *ib.* 9703, 9704.

2. *Extensive Import of Diseased Animals:*

Introduction of 30,000 foreign animals affected with foot-and-mouth disease in the years 1875 and 1876, *Brown* 517–520——Large number of cargoes landed in the last three years which have been affected with the disease, *Wilson* 4701.

Very large number of cases of foot-and-mouth disease detected at the ports, these cases being dealt with in a variety of ways instead of under a uniform system, *Tisdall*

Report, 1877—*continued.*

FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE—continued.

2. *Extensive Import of Diseased Animals*—continued.

9427, 9428——Import of many animals from Belgium and Holland with foot-and-mouth disease in 1875 without any official intimation from those countries, *Read* 9574-9576. 9668-9670. 9761.

3. *Losses from the Disease:*

Monetary loss by witness from foot-and-mouth disease to the extent of 30,000 *l.* or 40,000 *l.*, *Booth* 2341, 2342——Prejudicial effect of foot-and-mouth disease upon the milk of cows, *Baron von Behr* 2572, 2573——Very heavy losses of witness from the disease, *Rea* 3592-3594——Serious loss to farmers when their beasts are attacked with foot-and-mouth disease; average of more than 2 *l.* per head, and of 4 *l.* in some cases, *Sheldon* 4532-4537.

Severe losses from foot-and-mouth disease subsequently to the removal of the cattle-plague restrictions in 1865-1866; comment hereon upon the action of Government at the time in ceasing to furnish returns of the losses from disease, *Wilson* 4746-4750. 4754. 5095-5098——Particulars as to the serious losses of witness from foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia, those animals suffering most from the latter which had previously suffered from the former, *ib.* 4785-4798——Considerable loss of witness through an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease among his ewes before lambing, *ib.* 4798——Illustration of the great loss to the country as well as to owners when cattle are attacked with the disease, *ib.* 4878-4885——Greater loss from foot-and-mouth disease than from pleuro-pneumonia or cattle plague, *ib.* 4886-4890. 4975.

Reference to certain calculations as to the enormous annual loss when foot-and-mouth disease is rife, as compared with the value of the total annual import of cattle, *Wilson* 5044-5051.

Representations in detail as to the exceedingly heavy losses incurred by farmers in Wiltshire by foot-and-mouth disease among cattle, sheep, and pigs; statistics hereon for the years 1872 and 1875, *Stratton* 6774-6783——Much greater loss by depreciation in value than by death; average of not less than 2 *l.* per head, whilst the loss on milch cows in summer is as much as 5 *l.* per head, *ib.* 6778, 6779. 6834-6836——Excessive prevalence of foot-and-mouth disease in other counties as well as in Wiltshire in 1872 and 1875, *ib.* 6865, 6866.

Serious loss of witness from foot-and-mouth disease in 1871 and 1873; average depreciation of 2 *l.* per head of cattle attacked, *Melvin* 8735-8741——Statement as to foot-and-mouth disease being far more infectious and destructive than pleuro-pneumonia, *Tisdall* 9473-9476.

Reference to the cessation of official returns of foot-and-mouth disease as having been due solely to the expense involved, *Brown* 10050, 10051——Great boon to the consumer in this country as well as to the farmer, by an eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, *ib.* 10227, 10228.

4. *Suggestions as to the Restrictions to be enforced; Good Effect of the Cattle Plague Regulations:*

Concurrence in the view as to the expediency of strict regulations at home with reference to the movement of animals, *Brown* 309. 313. 335-344. 513-516. 545-548. 820-826; *Wilson* 4764-4781; *Read* 9621-9626. 9671-9679——Proposed prohibition of movement from any centre where the disease is discovered, *Brown* 310——Readiness with which foot-and-mouth disease could be stamped out if it were the only disease we had to deal with, *ib.* 656-659——Movement of animals suffering from foot-and-mouth disease permitted under certain circumstances under an Order of the Privy Council, *ib.* 966.

Anticipated outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease averted by means of the existing restrictions in consequence of the cattle plague; belief that it would be quite possible to stamp out the disease in England, *Booth* 2335-2337. 2340. 2345, 2346. 2350-2356. 2367——Suggestions as to the regulations desirable, *ib.* 2367-2375. 2401-2408——Inexpediency of stamping out foot-and-mouth disease by slaughter; opinion that the stoppage of movement in infected districts would be sufficient, *ib.* 2367-2375. 2442-2446——Approval of more stringent restrictions in the case of this disease; suggested closing of local fairs and markets, *Rea* 3595 *et seq.* 3630-3636. 3646-3655. 3662, 3663.

Impossibility of stamping out foot-and-mouth disease, *Lambert* 3910. 3978. 4039, 4040——Expediency of the disease being unrestricted, with the exception of travelling on the high road, and being shown at store fairs; necessity of a heavy penalty to prevent this, *ib.* 3972. 3975. 4036. 4063. 4175-4177. 4181, 4182——Complaint as regards foot-and-mouth disease that the law in regard to it is harassing and vexatious in every way; argument that the remedy of stamping it out is worse than the disease, *ib.* 3954-3984. 4008-4011. 4036-4040. 4063-4069. 4126-4129.

Report, 1877—*continued.*

FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE—continued.

4. *Suggestions as to the Restrictions to be enforced, &c.*—continued.

Approval of strict regulations for stamping out cattle plague and pleuro-pneumonia, but not foot-and-mouth disease, *Hamilton* 4268–4273. 4299–4303——Facilities desirable for the removal of cattle suffering from foot-and-mouth disease to slaughter-houses, *ib.* 4274-4276.

Considerations as to the severe restrictions desirable in order to exterminate foot-and-mouth disease, *Sheldon* 4662–4674——Doubt as to the necessity of so long a period as six years for stamping out the disease, *Wilson* 4775-4778. 5077——Dissent from the conclusions of the Select Committee of 1873 as to the modified restrictions desirable, *ib.* 5099, 5100.

Existence of this disease in nearly every country, as well as England, witness strongly disapproving of the restrictions in reference to the import of cattle affected with the disease, *Giblett* 6570. 6576-6579. 6615-6625. 6725-6728.

Statement showing the beneficial effect of the cattle-plague restrictions in stamping out foot-and-mouth disease, *Stratton* 6812–6815. 6935-6937——Expediency of the proposed continuance of restrictions with a view to stamping out foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia, *ib.* 6826-6833. 6845-6849——Expediency of the compulsory slaughter of all animals affected with foot-and-mouth disease; satisfaction to be given to farmers thereby, *ib.* 6917-6920.

Conclusion as to the facility of stamping out this disease by stopping foreign import; the disease would in such case die out, *Gamgee* 6966-6970. 7025——Modified restrictions necessary if foreign cattle be excluded, *ib.* 6993–6996. 7024——Further statement that the disease will promptly die out, if foreign cattle be excluded, *ib.* 7080. 7087. 7108–7111.

Suggestions for an improved system of isolation in cases of foot and mouth disease; objection of the farmers to a stoppage of any general movement or of markets on account of the disease, *Saulby* 7289–7302. 7320, 7321. 7336, 7337——Conviction of witness that disease should be dealt with immediately, and stamped out by strict measures, which he considers quite feasible, *Howard* 8282–8286. 8390. 8394–8407. 8414–8418——Suggested prohibition of movement for one month out of any area in which foot-and-mouth disease has occurred, *Melvin* 8818, 8819.

Tendency of the disease to die out after a time; belief that if not re-imported it could be very easily suppressed throughout the country, *Read* 9600-9603. 9660-9667——Great loss caused more especially by foot-and-mouth disease, so that effectual measures should be adopted for its isolation and suppression, *ib.* 9750–9752——Proposed localisation of the restrictions upon movement, *ib.* 9754.

Important effect of the cattle-plague regulations and restrictions in diminishing the amount of disease throughout the country; particulars hereon, *Brown* 9874–9885——Conviction of witness that the disease will increase when the regulations now in force over the country, and the cordon round the metropolis are removed, *ib.* 9883.

Further statement that in order to eradicate foot-and-mouth disease from England the necessary restrictions must continue in force for a considerable time, *Brown* 9886–9890——Suggestions as to the restrictions necessary in reference to movement from localities where disease exists, *ib.* 9890–9894. 10056, 10057. 10101, 10102. 10270-10274——Conclusion that a prohibition of import would not suffice for the disappearance of the disease, unless accompanied by stringent precautions at home, *ib.* 9890–9894.

Diminution of foot-and-mouth disease by means of local restrictions, though when the disease is prevalent over the whole country more extensive and stringent regulations are necessary, *Brown* 9989, 9990——Expediency restrictions as to the slaughtering of home cattle in contact with others having foot-and-mouth disease, *ib.* 10059-10063——Opinion that if the necessary restrictions were not thwarted by the farmers, the disease might be obliterated in twelve months, *ib.* 10087–10092. 10229——Doubt as to the disease having died out naturally in some counties where restrictions have not been enforced, *ib.* 10261–10263.

5. *Orders of the Privy Council:*

Orders issued by the Privy Council in relation to the foot-and-mouth disease, to the effect that the action should be the same all through the country, *Brown* 595–606——Order in force at present that if one animal in a foreign cargo is found affected with the disease the whole of such cargo shall be slaughtered, *ib.* 736–742.

Regulations laid down in the various Orders of Council since August 1873, on the subject of foot-and-mouth disease, *App.* 512 *et seq.*

Form of movement license prescribed by the Animals Order of 1875, *App.* 533.

6. *Amount*

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Foot-and-Mouth Disease—continued.

6. *Amount of Disease at the present Time:*

Considerable freedom of this country from foot-and-mouth disease at the present time, *Booth* 2357-2360——In May last there were twenty-four counties in England subject to the disease, *Brown* 10281.

7. *Conclusions of the Committee:*

Reference by the Committee to the great losses entailed by the disease, *Rep.* iv——Conclusion as to the home restrictions necessary in reference to the disease; suggestion that absolute prohibition of movement be enforced against infected farms for twenty-eight days, *ib.* v. ix, x.——Summary of the regulations and restrictions proposed, *ib.* ix, x.

See also *Bedfordshire. Breconshire. Bristol. Denmark. Fairs and Markets. Farmers. Foreign Cattle. Germany. Gloucestershire. Holland. Home Supply. Inspection. Ireland, &c.*, I. 9. *Movement of Cattle. Norfolk. Pigs. Privy Council. Quarantine. Spain and Portugal. Yorkshire.*

Foreign Cattle:

I. *As to the Import of Live Cattle:*

1. Advocacy of Prohibition of Import, in view of the Liability to Cattle Plague and other Diseases.
2. Evidence in Defence of continued Facilities of Import.
3. Amount of Import hitherto.
4. Orders and Regulations of the Privy Council.

II. *As to the Slaughtering of Foreign Cattle at the Port of Debarkation:*

1. Evidence favourable to an Extended System of Compulsory Slaughter of Foreign Cattle.
2. Evidence adverse to the foregoing Proposal.
3. Notice necessary before Application of the Proposal.
4. Orders and Regulations of the Privy Council.

III. *As to the Import of Disease by means of Foreign Cattle; conflicting Evidence on the Subject.*

IV. *Conclusions and Recommendations of the Committee.*

I. *As to the Import of Live Cattle:*

1. Advocacy of Prohibition of Import, in view of the Liability to Cattle Plague and other Diseases:

Concurrence of evidence in favour of prohibition of import of live cattle, in view of the danger of importing cattle plague, *Brown* 314-344. 509-513. 699 *et seq.*; 889, 890. 976-978. 1068-1070. 9906, 9907. 10438-10440; *Booth* 2350 *et seq.*; *Wilson* 4976; *Giblett* 6566-6568; *Gamgee* 6940 *et seq.*; *Soulby* 7258-7266. 7268, 7269; *Rudkin* 8982; *Read* 9577-9579. 9649-9659. 9724-9727——Opinion that slaughter at the port of debarkation would not be a sufficient protection against the cattle plague, *Simons* 1197. 1208.

Expediency of prohibiting the importation into this country of live stock, even if there were no such disease as cattle plague; grounds for this opinion, *Booth* 2322. 2326. 2335. 2361, 2362. 2376-2380. 2386-2391. 2424, 2425——Argument that cattle plague, pneumonia, and foot-and-mouth disease undoubtedly came to this country from the Continent, and that if importation were strictly prohibited from infected countries we should get rid of these diseases eventually, *ib.* 2381-2385. 2438-2441.——Expediency of prohibiting the importation of cattle from Russia, where cattle plague has always existed, *Lyon* 3303.

Expediency of prohibiting the import of cattle from abroad in conjunction with severe restrictions at home; legitimate complaint which the farmers would have if severe restrictions were imposed at home, without dealing with the fountain-head of the disease, which is importation from the Continent, *Rea* 3607-3612. 3660-3664. 3669. 3675-3679. 3704-3715. 3734-3736. 3764. 3770-3782. 3790-3796——Decided opinion that the prohibition of the importation of foreign cattle would be a benefit and not a loss to the country, *ib.* 3803-3805.

Opinion that the importation of live cattle from the Continent should be entirely prohibited as a security against cattle plague chiefly, and as a protection also against pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease, *Sheldon* 4514-4522. 4563-4573. 4579-4581——Explanation that witness would not exclude animals from any country distinctly proved to be absolutely free from disease, *ib.* 4569-4572——Difficulty in applying sufficient

FOREIGN CATTLE—continued.

I. *As to the Import of Live Cattle*—continued.

1. Advocacy of Prohibition of Import, &c.—*continued.*

precautions for preventing the import of foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia short of absolute prohibition of all import of live cattle, *Sheldon* 4860–4684.

Resolution passed by the Council of the Agricultural Society in March last in favour of the total prohibition of the import of live stock from European ports, this resolution having led to the present inquiry, *Wilson* 4692–4695——Necessity of stringent regulations at home concurrently with prohibitory regulations as to foreign import, *ib.* 5116, 5117.

Witness gave evidence before the Select Committee of 1873, and fully adheres to the conclusions and recommendations then expressed by him upon the questions at issue, *Gamgee* 6940–6956——Confirmation of witness in his former opinion that the import of live cattle should be prohibited in conjunction with a system of slaughtering at the port of debarkation, and of quarantine in the case of store cattle, *ib.* 6949, 6950. 6955, 6956. 7004–7006. 7023–7025.

Statement as to the improved position of the farmer previously to the import of foreign cattle in 1840, *Gamgee* 6999. 7104–7107——Comment upon the omission of the governing authorities to be guided by the experience of the past as regards the exclusion of foreign cattle, *ib.* 6999.

Further argument that the import of live cattle should be at once absolutely stopped, and that a largely increased dead-meat trade will immediately arise, *Gamgee* 7033–7036. 7085–7103. 7112–7120——Entire dissent from Mr. Giblett's evidence as to the advantages of a live cattle-trade over a dead-meat trade, *ib.* 7216, 7217. 7228.

Disapproval of import from any country where cattle plague is known to exist, *Soulby* 7258–7260——Approval, however, of import from Denmark, Spain, and any other countries if it can be proved that no risks are incurred thereby, *ib.* 7261–7267. 7332.

Evidence in support of the conclusion that an improved system of inspection and increased restrictions generally on the part of Germany and other foreign countries cannot be relied upon as sufficient precaution against the export of diseased animals to England, *Read* 9567–9576. 9682, 9683. 9761–9763.

Witness further submits that import should be entirely prohibited from Germany and Belgium, and that cattle from other countries should be slaughtered at the port of landing, as the only means of effectually keeping contagious diseases out of the country, *Brown* 9906, 9907. 10438–10440.

2. Evidence in Defence of continued Facilities of Import:

Grounds for the opinion that if the importation of cattle in England from any part of the world were absolutely prohibited it would be a very serious calamity to the public, *Hall* 2981–2986——Decided opinion that the introduction of live cattle from abroad is absolutely material to the supply of London; argument that to shut them out would be very unwise policy, *Lyon* 3153. 3156. 3303. 3400. 3447——Expediency of bringing over all continental meat supplies in the shape of live animals; great importance to this country of the continental supply of live cattle, *ib.* 3167–3169. 3337, 3338. 3399–3401. 3440. 3447. 3511–3536——Inexpediency of stopping the importation of live cattle into England; belief that such a measure would be a great public disadvantage, *Lambert* 4059–4062.

Conclusion as to the inexpediency of further restrictions upon import as regards pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease; strict regulations in force at the foreign port, *Gebhardt* 5182–5185——Importance of a continued supply of the comparatively inferior cattle taken from London for country and mining districts; explanation that the meat is sound and good, though the animals are small, *ib.* 5494, 5495. 5648–5654——Existence of foreign import for about thirty-five years, whilst the American supply is comparatively untried; expediency of trade being allowed to regulate itself as between the two modes of supply, *ib.* 5510–5513. 5677–5684. 5769, 5770. 5777, 5778——Desire further expressed by witness for a modification of the present restrictions upon import as soon as they can be safely relaxed, *ib.* 5745–5748.

Belief that cattle epidemics cannot be prevented by stopping foreign import, *Pool* 5837——Opinion that foreign import should be entirely stopped from all countries which cannot show a clean bill of health, but not from healthy countries, *ib.* 5838. 6001, 6002——Interest of witness in the import of live cattle, though he would not allow them to come if there were real danger of disease thereby, *ib.* 5953–5959.

Conviction of witness that an entire exclusion of foreign cattle would never answer, *Giblett* 6680, 6681.

3. Amount

Report, 1877—*continued.*

FOREIGN CATTLE—continued.

I. *As to the Import of Live Cattle*—continued.

3. Amount of Import hitherto:

Impossibility of making a satisfactory computation of the proportion that the import of cattle bears to the consumption in England; belief that the introduction of dead meat does not materially affect the calculation, *Brown* 680-692.

Total of 75,430 foreign beasts, and 77,150 English beasts sold in the Islington market in the five months, July to November 1876, *Gebhardt* 5215, 5216——Few foreign cattle sold in the first six months of 1877, import from Germany being prohibited, *ib.* 5224.

Sale of 81,480 British cattle, and of only 32,640 foreign cattle in the first six months of 1876, *Gebhardt* 5410——Total of about 158,000 English, and 108,000 foreign cattle sold in eleven months in 1876, *ib.* 5412, 5413.

Exception taken to certain statistics as to the comparatively small import of foreign cattle in relation to the home supply generally; large import of the former into London, *Giblett* 6715-6718. 6763-6765.

Different period of the year at which cattle are imported from Denmark, Germany, Holland and other countries, *Robinson* 8548-8553——Doubt as to the amount of import of live stock in proportion to the total consumption, *Lyon* 3356. 3366-3368.

4. Orders and Regulations of the Privy Council:

Regulations and restrictions under various Orders of Council since August 1873, in reference to import from different foreign countries, *App.* 512 *et seq.*

II. *As to the Slaughtering of Foreign Cattle at the Port of Debarkation:*

1. Evidence favourable to an extended System of Compulsory Slaughter of Foreign Cattle:

Desirability from a sanitary point of view of sending all imported cattle to Deptford, or of making arrangements for slaughtering at Thames Haven, *Brown* 725, 726——Suggestious as to the countries which should be scheduled in regard to importation of cattle, *Simonds* 1218-1223. 1266-1274. 1278-1291.

Insufficiency of inspection and slaughter at the port of debarkation as a means of preventing the spread of cattle plague, so that the Agricultural Society were constrained to recommend total prohibition of import, *Wilson* 4701. 4704——Alternative proposition that prohibition of import be confined to those countries in which disease is known to exist, or into which diseased animals are introduced, and that import be allowed from other countries provided the cattle be slaughtered at the port of debarkation, *ib.* 4719-4725. 5083-5086——Limited risk of the spread of disease if the animals be slaughtered on landing, *ib.* 4827, 4828——Less severe restrictions required as to slaughter in the case of pleuro-pneumonia than of cattle plague, *ib.* 4890-4892.

Recommendations by the Central Chamber of Agriculture on the subject of slaughter at the port of debarkation, *Stratton* 6788.

Concurrence of evidence in favour of the compulsory slaughter at Deptford of all foreign cattle coming into the Port of London, *Stratton* 6853; *Odams* 7967-7970; *Howard* 8274-8278; *Robinson* 8579. 8586-8590. 8604-8606. 8949-8654; *Rudkin* 8955-8960. 8967, 8968. 9086-9091. 9146-9148.

Explanation of witness' views in favour of the total prohibition of the import of fat animals, save for slaughter, *Gamgee* 6949, 6950. 6955, 6956. 7004-7006. 7023-7025.

Witness recommended in 1873, and still considers, that all foreign fat cattle coming in the holds of vessels should be slaughtered at the port of debarkation; that is, on the score chiefly of the proved failure of inspection, *Odams* 7934-7946. 8006-8017. 8026, 8027. 8040-8043. 8052-8055. 8071-8074. 8137——Advocacy of the slaughtering of all foreign fat cattle at the port of entry, *Howard* 8200, 8201. 8251-8255. 8269, 8270. 8313-8325. 8405-8410.

Conclusion that cattle from all foreign countries should be slaughtered at Deptford; objection to any exception in favour of Denmark, or any other country comparatively free from disease, *Robinson* 8579-8601. 8656-8660——Opinion that neither from America, Spain, Denmark, nor any other country, should cattle be admitted for circulation in England, but should be slaughtered at the port of landing, *Melvin* 8868-8875.

Conclusion, reluctantly arrived at, that all foreign cattle should be necessarily slaughtered at the port of landing, there being defined ports for the purpose, *Rudkin* 8958, 8959. 8981. 9085, 9086. 9140-9148. 9163, 9164. 9219——Objection to an absolute prohibition

Report, 1877—*continued.*

FOREIGN CATTLE—continued.

II. *As to the Slaughtering of Foreign Cattle, &c.*—continued.

1. Evidence favourable to an extended System, &c.—*continued.*

of the import of live animals into London; probable effect for some time in raising the price of meat, *Rudkin* 9099-9103. 9205, 9206——Belief that compulsory slaughter at Deptford would not have the effect of discouraging the import of live animals from abroad, *ib.* 9144-9148——Statement that the Corporation of London is actuated solely by public considerations in advocating slaughter at Deptford, *ib.* 9151-9153.

Approval of a cordon round other large towns as well as London, so that foreign cattle might be admitted within the cordon for slaughter, *Rudkin* 9202, 9203.

Strong advocacy of the slaughtering of all foreign fat cattle at the port of debarkation, as recommended by the Cattle Plague Commission in February 1866, *Read* 9517, 9518. 9521. 9641, 9642. 9647, 9648. 9724-9727. 9759-9764.

Argument also that in order to extirpate pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease it is essential to slaughter all foreign cattle, sheep, and pigs at the port of debarkation, *Brown* 10016-10019. 10045.

2. Evidence adverse to the foregoing Proposal:

Disapproval of slaughter at the port of debarkation as regards protection to the health of the stock in this country; argument that there should be no restriction as to cattle from countries where the plague does not exist, *Swan* 1650, 1651. 1683-1690.

Belief that if all the cattle imported to Deptford had to be slaughtered at the port of debarkation the production would greatly diminish, *Thomsen* 2170-2174.

Importance of continuing the importation of live cattle into England, and of not depending wholly upon dead meat; absolute necessity for a butcher to have live animals on his premises so as to slaughter them as his trade requires, *Lyon* 3153 *et seq.* 3511-3536.

Opinion that the regulations as to slaughter at the port should be relaxed, and that we should return to the regulations in force before the last outbreak of cattle plague, *Gebhardt* 5434-5437——Decided objection to an extended system of compulsory slaughter at Deptford, *ib.* 5483-5493——Limited inconvenience through the uncertainty whether any cargo may not be ordered to Deptford on the score of disease, *ib.* 5486-5489—— Heavy penalty upon foreign dealers in the loss incurred when they ship diseased animals which are subsequently slaughtered, *ib* 5659, 5660.

Expediency of complete free trade with all healthy countries, the cattle being allowed to go to a public market instead of being slaughtered at Deptford, *Pool* 5838, 5839. 6001-6009. 6039-6044. 6072-6081——Approval of foreign cattle being freely imported from all countries save where there is cattle plague, without any restriction as to slaughtering at the port, *Walker* 7825, 7826. 7908, 7909——Effect of compulsory slaughter in diminishing the imports, *Knowles* 9247. 9280.

3. Notice necessary before Application of the Proposal:

Fairness in at least giving due notice to the foreigner before import is prohibited or compulsory slaughter at the port is required, *Gebhardt* 5677. 5769, 5770——Long notice necessary before applying a system of compulsory slaughter of foreign animals, *Rudkin* 9205, 9206——Notice required to be given before applying restrictions as to slaughtering at the ports generally; expediency of this being done by Act other than by Order of Council, *Brown* 10020, 10021, 10040, 10041. 10204, 10205.

4. Orders and Regulations of the Privy Council:

Directions of the Privy Council in sundry Orders of Council since August 1873 on the subject of slaughter at the port of debarkation, *App.* 512 *et seq.*

III. *As to the Import of Disease by means of Foreign Cattle; conflicting Evidence on the Subject:*

Information in detail respecting the origin of the several cattle diseases in this country; conclusion that pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease arise irrespectively of foreign import, *Brown* 291, 292. 333-308. 507, 508. 548-555. 811-820. 851, 852. 945, 946——Belief that both pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease are originated only by infection, *ib.* 913-921. 10083, 10084.

Considerations as to the effect of importation upon the introduction of cattle disease into England, *Simonds* 1110 *et seq.*——Opinion that contagious diseases of cattle are never originated spontaneously in Western Europe, but that they are spread by contagion, *Müller* 1591.

Concurrence in the view that pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease are native as well as foreign, *Swan* 1773-1779; *Gebhardt* 5172-5178, 5552-5561. 5713-5715; *Pool* 5951, 5952; *Giblett* 6567. 6576, 6577. 6698-6700. 6719, 6720——Opinion that

cattle

Report, 1877—*continued.*

FOREIGN CATTLE—continued.

III. *As to the Import of Disease by means of Foreign Cattle, &c.*—continued.

cattle plague is an imported disease, but that pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease can be generated in this country without either contagion or infection from abroad, *Swan* 1773-1776.

Concurrence of evidence to the effect that pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease owe their existence in this country to the import of foreign cattle, *Booth* 2381–2385; *Sheldon* 4541–4563; *Stratton* 6816-6819. 6845-6849. 6927-6932; *Gamgee* 7169 *et seq.*; *Howard* 8191–8196; *Read* 9619, 9620. 9664, 9665——Belief that not only cattle plague but pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease came originally into this country from abroad, though the latter two diseases may since have become indigenous, *Booth* 2381–2385. 2420; *Sheldon* 4541–4563.

Decided opinion as to the generally healthy state of the Schleswig-Holstein, the Danish and the Spanish cattle; occasional instances of pleuro-pneumonia in Dutch cattle, *Lyon* 3187-3189. 3194-3196. 3287–3289——Less amount of foot-and-mouth disease in foreign than in home cattle; opinion that the health of foreign cattle contrasts favourably with that of our own, *ib.* 3502. 3554–3557. 3560-3563——Result of witness' experience that continental cattle have much less disease than English cattle, *Giblett* 6616–6622.

Witness does not consider Professor Brown an authority on contagious cattle diseases: witness' views on the subject have on the other hand invariably proved correct, *Gamgee* 7088–7090——Evidence purporting to show that pleuro-pneumonia, foot-and-mouth disease, cattle plague, and certain other diseases, were originally imported into this country from abroad, *ib.* 7169–7173. 7204–7215. 7227——Several diseases indigenous to the cattle of this country, *ib.* 7204, 7205.

Belief in the germ theory, as regards the production of contagious diseases, *Howard* 8190. 8196. 8260. 8360, 8361. 8389——Grounds for the conclusion that pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease are not produced spontaneously in England, but come from abroad; neither of these diseases in this country formerly, *ib.* 8191–8196. 8411–8413——Diseases attributed to foreign import, *Smith* 8457; *Melvin* 8777.

IV. *Conclusions and Recommendations of the Committee:*

Proposed addition to the list of scheduled countries, all fat cattle imported therefrom to be slaughtered at the port of debarkation, *Rep.* vi. ix.

Recommendation that as a statutory arrangement the importation of all animals from Russia, and of cattle from Germany (except Schleswig-Holstein) and Belgium, be prohibited, and these last two countries as to other animals, and the rest of Europe as to all animals, should be added to the last of scheduled countries, with power to the Privy Council to forbid the importation of animals from other countries if they think fit, *Rep.* vi. ix.

Considerable improvement expected from a system of compulsory slaughter at Deptford, *Rep.* vii.

Proposal that the commencement of the change be postponed for a time sufficient to enable the necessary preparations to be carried out, *Rep.* vii.

See also *American Cattle. Australia. Belgium. Canada. Cattle Plague. Cattle Salesmen. Cattle Ships. Dead Meat. Denmark. Deptford Market. Farmers. Foot-and-Mouth Disease. France. Free Trade. Germany. Glasgow. Holland. Home Supply. Inspection. Liverpool. Metropolitan Cattle Market. Pleuro-pneumonia. Ports. Price of Meat. Quarantine. Russia. Schleswig-Holstein. South America. Spain and Portugal. Store Cattle. Sweden and Norway.*

France. Discontinuance of import from France since the necessity of slaughtering at Deptford, *Gebhardt* 5735–5738——Tendency to reduction of price in France if foreign cattle be excluded from England: question whether this might not induce foreign producers to send dead meat to this country, *Pool* 6050–6056.

Great falling off in the consignments of French cattle to witness since the restrictions in force as to slaughtering at Deptford, *Giblett* 6483–6497. 6624. 6733——Considerable amount of foot and mouth disease among cattle from France: belief that this is largely engendered at Deptford, *ib.* 6701–6707——Greatly diminished supply from France since the late war, *Robinson* 8549, 8550.

Free Trade. Interference with free trade by barring the import of foreign cattle: approval of competition by means of a dead meat supply, *Gebhardt* 5240. 5254, 5255——Witness submits that there should be free trade and an open market, except for cattle from countries where there is contagious disease, *Pool* 5838, 5839. 6001–6009. 6035–6044. 6078, 6079. 6072–6081——Decided opinion that every facility should be given to the import both of live cattle and dead meat, *Giblett* 6524. 6569. 6769.

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Free Trade—continued.

Cheerful acceptance of free trade by English farmers: natural desire, however, for security against disease, *Howard* 8202, 8203. 8371. 8392, 8393——Advocacy of free trade, but not of free trade in cattle disease, *Melvin* 8904, 8905——Opinion that there should be free trade alike in dead meat and live cattle, but not in the import of disease, *Rudkin* 9031. 9037-9039. 9099, 9100. 9163. 9204.

Freights. Relative cost of freight of live cattle and of dead meat; obstacle on this score to the profitable import of live cattle, save from America, *Hamilton* 4377-4384. 4397-4403——Much cheaper freight in the case of dead meat than of live stock, *Sheldon* 4594-4598.

Less cost in the transmission of dead meat than of live stock; objection, however, to free trade in the matter, *Wilson* 4998-5001——About equal cost in bringing a live animal from Hamburg and a carcase from America, *ib.* 5069-5073——Conclusion as to the higher freight when an animal comes as dead meat from Hamburg or Holland to Hull than when it comes alive, *Knowles* 9286-9290. 9329-9332.

See also *American Dead Meat*, III. *Cattle Ships. Ireland, &c.*, 1-3.

G.

Gamgee, Professor John. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Has devoted many years to the exclusive study of cattle diseases, and the means of exterminating them, 6938, 6939——Gave evidence before the Select Committee of 1873, and fully adheres to the conclusions and recommendations then expressed by him upon the questions at issue, 6940-6956.

Confirmation of witness in his former opinon that the import of live cattle should be prohibited, in conjunction with a system of slaugtering at the port of debarkation, and of quarantine in the case of store cattle, 6949, 6950. 6955, 6956. 7004-7006——Views expressed by witness in 1869 and 1873 as to the feasibility of a dead-meat trade from abroad by means of a refrigeration process; part taken by him in leading to the subsequent development of this trade, 6951-6954. 6957. 6983. 7020-7022——Calculation that from 70 to 75 per cent. of the total mortality of cattle in this country is due to international or foreign disease, 6958-6960.

Peculiarly contagious and infectious character of foot-and-mouth disease, the import of one or two diseased animals contaminating very large numbers, 6959-6965——Conclusion as to the facility of stamping out this disease by stopping foreign import; the disease would in such case die out, 6966-6970. 7025——Positive and definite character of the restrictions required as regards pleuro-pneumonia, the stoppage of import being essential, 6971-6975——Reduced losses from cattle plague by reason of the prompt remedies applied for its suppression, 6976-6982.

Very large dead-meat supply expected not only from America but from the Continent, if live cattle be entirely excluded, 6983-6992——Activity in the foreign dead-meat trade during the restrictions upon import in 1865; 6986——Immense supply of cattle in America (including some 10,000,000 in Texas) available for export to England in the form of dead meat, 6989-6991——Disapproval of severe restrictions upon inland movement of cattle as not necessary in regard to foot-and-mouth disease if foreign cattle be excluded, 6993-6996——Expediency of a minimum of interference with the home trade generally, 6994. 7024——Improbability of any danger from the import of live stock from Canada; witness would prefer, however, to prohibit all import, 6996, 6997. 7003, 7004—— Liability to the import of pleuro-pneumonia by American cattle, 6997.

Existence of pleuro-pneumonia in Denmark in recent years, whilst in former times cattle plague came to this country from Denmark, 6998-7002——Disease and scarcity in the period from 1714 to 1770, cattle plague having been imported, whilst from 1770 to 1840 (when there was no import of foreign cattle), the home supply greatly increased, and the price of meat was much cheaper, 6999——Comment upon the omission of the governing authorities to be guided by the experience of the past as regards the exclusion of foreign cattle, *ib.*

Reluctant approval of a system of quarantine for store cattle; very stringent regulations desirable in connection therewith, 7006-7011——Expected readiness of dairymen in the metropolis to submit to strict regulations for the suppression of lung disease, 7008. 7017-7019——Conclusion, however, that it would be much better if all large towns were supplied with milk by means of suburban dairies, 7012-7014. 7017——Reduced supply and increased price of milk in towns (as in Dublin) since the introduction of disease, 7014-7016.

Particulars relative to experiments by witness in Texas, in 1869, which resulted in the application of the dry cold air process, since adopted in the American dead-meat trade, 7020-7022.

Further explanation of witness' present views in favour of the total prohibition of the import of live animals, save for slaughter, or under quarantine in the case of store cattle, 7020-7025.

[Second

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Gamgee, Professor John. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

[Second Examination.]—Prevalence of cattle diseases in Schleswig-Holstein at different periods, 7028–7032——Further advocacy of a prohibition upon the import of live stock, whilst there should be but little restriction upon the home trade, 7033–7036. 7056, 7057——Expediency of stopping import from Spain and Portugal, though the cattle are naturally healthy, 7037–7039. 7141–7144.

Limited extent to which the dead meat import took the place of the live cattle import when the latter was restricted in 1865; 7040–7042——Examination as to the data for witness' conclusion that some 70 per cent. of the cattle mortality in England was due to imported diseases; reference more especially to the very large mortality from pleuro-pneumonia, 7043–7055. 7061–7074——Necessity of isolation and other preventive home measures for pleuro-pneumonia, but only for a time, 7056, 7057.

Question considered as to the accuracy of witness' computation that there are 10,000,000 cattle in Texas, 7058–7060*——Much greater liability of England than of Ireland to be affected with international diseases, 7075–7079——Spread of disease mainly from the large towns, 7079——Further statement that foot-and-mouth disease will promptly die out, if foreign cattle be excluded, 7080. 7087. 7108–7111——Infection of Holland through having imported foreign cattle, or through mediate contagion, 7081–7085. 7109, 7110.

Further argument that the import of live cattle should be at once absolutely stopped, and that a largely increased dead-meat trade will immediately arise, 7085–7103. 7112–7120——Witness does not consider Professor Brown an authority on contagious cattle diseases; witness' views on the subject have, on the other hand, invariably proved correct, 7088–7090——Facility for making improved arrangements for the storage and transit of dead meat on arrival from America, 7095–7103. 7120–7126. 7217.

Belief that the price of meat would not be affected to the extent of one farthing a pound by at once excluding foreign cattle, 7099, 7100. 7112–7115——Further statement as to the improved position of the farmer previously to the import of foreign cattle in 1840; 7104–7107——Facility in establishing a dead-meat trade from the Continent as well as from America, 7115–7117——Perfectly sound state in which the offal may be imported, 7118.

Belief that prices will in time be much lower by the adoption of witness' proposals, 7124. 7136——Evidence in support of the conclusion that there is much more deterioration and waste in the transportation of live animals than of dead meat, 7126–7135. 7216. 7221. 7228——Steps taken in the establishment of a tinned-meat trade from South America, as well as from Australia, 7138–7140.

Further objection to the import of live stock from Holland, notwithstanding the precautions in that country against disease, 7145–7149——Similar objection in the case of Denmark, 7150–7155——Large surplus supplies of cattle in the States, though there may be a slight rise in prices through the English demand, 7156, 7157.

Doubt as to the expediency of preventing the import of offal and hides and dead meat on account of the risk of import of disease thereby, 7158–7165. 7223–7226——Approval of the exclusion of live sheep as being liable to communicate foot-and-mouth disease, 7166——Facility in the transport of sheep in the form of dead meat; practical experience of witness to this effect, 7167. 7200–7202——Opinion that Ireland should be treated as part of England, 7168——Prejudicial effect upon trade by the system of scheduling different foreign countries at different times, *ib.*

Further evidence purporting to show that pleuro-pneumonia, foot-and-mouth disease, cattle plague, and certain other diseases were originally imported into this country from abroad, 7169–7173. 7204–7215. 7227——Conclusion that in a very limited period of time, such as six months, pleuro-pneumonia might be stamped out, 7174–7176——Explanation as to the maintenance of foot-and-mouth disease in Ireland, though foreign cattle are not imported, 7177–7180.

Examination upon the question whether in the reign of George II. an Act was not passed prohibiting import on account of the cattle plague in the country; denial that there was complete exclusion of foreign cattle previously to the outbreaks in former times, 7181–7196. 7236–7238——Facility of artificially producing ice on board dead-meat ships, 7197–7199——Several diseases indigenous to the cattle of this country, 7204, 7205.

Witness repeats that foot-and-mouth disease was first introduced from abroad, although this conclusion may be at variance with the reports of the Veterinary Department of the Privy Council, 7208–7215. 7227——Entire dissent from Mr. Giblett's evidence as to the advantages of a live cattle trade over a dead-meat trade, 7216, 7217. 7228——Improved arrangements required both in England and America in connection with one dead-meat trade; these are quite feasible, 7217–7222.

Direct interest of Mr. Giblett and other cattle salesmen in upholding the import of live cattle, and in opposing the development of the dead-meat trade; twice as much commission is charged for the sale of a foreign bullock as of an English bullock, 7228–7235——Reference to an Act of Charles II., prohibiting the import of foreign cattle as having been passed irrespectively of the cattle plague, 7236–7238.

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Gebhardt, Herrman. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Long and extensive experience of witness in connection with the import of foreign cattle; he was examined on the subject before the Select Committees of 1868 and 1873; 5130–5134.

Undue delay on the part of the authorities of Hamburg in telegraphing information as to the outbreak of cattle plague in reference to the cargo of the "Castor"; prohibition of the landing of these cattle if a telegram had been sent direct to the Privy Council, 5135–5142. 5147—— Undue delay also, after the arrival of the cattle at Deptford, before they were killed and destroyed; dilatory and defective course pursued in boiling down the bodies, 5143, 5144. 5162–5170 —— Facility of obtaining prompt information from Germany whenever cattle plague brakes out, so that any vessel on the route might be stopped in time, 5145–5147.

Belief that if the increased restrictions proposed in Germany be properly carried out, cattle plague could never escape out of the country, 5148–5150——Special interest of Germany in the suppression of cattle plague, oxen being used for ploughing, 5151–5154 ——Stringent powers in the hands of the central authority in Germany, 5154, 5155. 5165, 5166——Importance of the regulations in this country being entirely under the control of the Privy Council, instead of their being enforced by local authorities, 5155–5161. 5171——Expediency of diseased carcases being buried instead of boiled down, 5162–5164.

Practical experience upon which witness concludes that pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease arise spontaneously, and cannot be stamped out by restrictions, 5172–5178——Reported outbreak of pleuro-pneumonia in Cornwall, said to have come from Ireland, 5178–5181——Conclusion as to the inexpediency of further restrictions upon import as regards pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease; strict regulations in force at the foreign port, 5182–5185.

Good condition and excellent quality of some American meat on arrival in this country, whilst on the other hand a large quantity is in very bad condition, is quite unfit for food, and is sold for about 1½*d.* per pound, 5186–5192. 5250, 5251——Probability of increased care in transmission with a view to the permanent establishment of a profitable trade, 5193–5197——Doubt as to diseased dead meat being capable of spreading disease, 5198–5201.

Grounds for the conclusion that it would never pay to send dead meat from the Continent to England, the import of live cattle being prohibited, 5202–5212——Difficulty as to supplies of ice for refrigerating meat from the Continent, 5203–5206——Large decrease of late in the supply of cattle from Germany, 5213.

Statement showing that in the five months, July to November 1876, there were 73,940 more foreign sheep than English sheep sold in the London market, 5214–5223——Total of 75,430 foreign beasts and 77,150 English beasts sold in the Islington market in the foregoing five months, 5215, 5,216——Very large import of foreign sheep in the first six months of 1877; 5223——Few foreign cattle sold, import from Germany being prohibited, 5224.

Considerable diminution in the export of sheep to England since France has opened her frontier; better price obtainable in Paris than at Deptford Market, 5225–5234—— Great demand for foreign sheep throughout the provinces; lower price by 1½*d.* or 2*d.* per pound realised by foreign than by English sheep, 5228——Strong objection to the restrictions as to the slaughter of foreign sheep at Deptford, 5230. 5235, 5236.

Opinion that there is no scope for a large increase in the home supply of cattle, foreign cattle being excluded, 5237–5239——Interference with free trade by barring the import of foreign cattle; approval of competition by means of a dead meat supply, 5240. 5254, 5255——Grounds for the conclusion that it is impracticable to establish a trade in the import of offal, as well as of dead meat, 5241–5247——Doubt as to the continued success of a dead-meat supply exclusively; probability of much of the supply being at times unfit for use, 5248–5251——Much higher price of meat but for the import from America, 5252, 5253.

[Second Examination.]—Official statistics in corroboration of former statement as to the greater number of foreign than of English sheep sold in the Islington Market from 1st July to 30th November 1876; 5404–5409——Sale of 81,480 British cattle and of only 32,640 foreign cattle in the first six months of 1876; 5410——Sale of 489,600 English as against 353,150 foreign sheep in the first six months of the year, 5410, 5411 ——Total of about 800,000 English and 750,000 foreign sheep sold in eleven months in 1876; 5412——Total of about 158,000 English and 108,000 foreign cattle sold in the same period, 5412, 5413.

Belief that a dead-meat supply in lieu of the foreign live cattle supply is not practicable; great uncertainty of a dead-meat trade, the market being sometimes glutted, and prices most uncertain, 5414–5433. 5570–5572. 5589——Advantage in being able to distribute foreign live cattle throughout the country, the distribution of dead meat not being feasible, as it will not keep, 5414–5417. 5427. 5429. 5671–5673——Unreliable character of the American supply further adverted to; necessity, moreover, of submitting

to

Gebhardt, Herrman. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

to a great reduction of price in order to sell the meat quickly, 5418. 5422-5426. 5570.

Effect of an extensive dead-meat trade in ruining the home trade; injury especially to the British farmer if the London market were no longer open to him, 5418-5420. 5430-5433. 5685-5695——Comment upon the practice of butchers in selling American for English meat and charging English prices, 5421, 5422. 5678, 5679——Gradual reduction from 7*d.* to 2*d.* per pound in the price realised by a recent cargo of American meat, whilst a considerable quantity had to be destroyed, 5423. 5424. 5570——Efforts made to send live cattle from America on account of the uncertainty of the dead-meat trade, 5428, 5429. 5565-5572. 5743, 5744.

Opinion that the regulations as to slaughter at the port should be relaxed, and that we should return to the regulations in force before the last outbreak of cattle plague, 5434-5437——Way in which the London cow-sheds operate in spreading pleuro-pneumonia, 5438-5440——Approval of a prohibition of cow-sheds in London, it being feasible to supply all the milk required from the country, 5441-5443.

Frequency of foot-and-mouth disease spreading through means of the lairs in the Islington market, 5444——Suggestion that Islington maket be limited to fat cattle, and that no animals be moved thence into the country save under a killing license, 5444-5450. 5521, 5522. 5659——Import of a cargo of cattle from Denmark with foot-and-mouth disease, whereas that country is said to be free from the disease, 5451-5455.

Very large dealings of witness in foreign cattle before the import was stopped, 5456, 5457——Impression that there is a much larger consumption of beef than mutton in London, 5458-5461——Small size of the sheep imported from Germany as compared with English sheep, 5462-5466——Good size of the home-bred beasts obtained from Schleswig-Holstein, whilst the Jutland store beasts are small, 5467.

Comparative infancy of the American dead-meat trade, it being difficult to say whether it will last, 5468——Number of beasts represented by the import of dead meat into London; effect thereof in keeping down the price of meat, 5469-5472——Belief that the price in London and all over England would be raised if all live cattle from the Continent were excluded, 5473, 5474——Slight difference in price which would divert foreign sheep and cattle to Paris instead of to London, 5475-5479——Question whether dead meat could not be brought from St. Petersburgh and other Russian ports at a profit, 5480-5482.

Evidence strongly opposed to a permanent system whereby all foreign cattle should be obliged to go to Deptford for slaughter; great injury thereby to the foreign exporters, who would, in fact, shun the market as much as much as possible, 5438-5493——Limited inconvenience through the uncertainty whether any cargo may not be ordered to Deptford on the score of disease, 5486-5489——Explanation as to a great deal of inferior meat going from London into the country; effect of the dead-meat supply on this score, 5494, 5495.

Estimate that about half the supply of foreign beasts and sheep sold at Islington go into the country, 5496. 5499——Practice of selling on Monday the beasts which arrive on Saturday or in good time on Monday, 5498——Injurious effect of a cordon round London beyond which cattle could not be sent out of London; enhanced price of meat outside the cordon, 5500-5507.

Considerable margin at present for a reduction of prices, as by an increased import of American meat, 5508, 5509——Existence of foreign import for about thirty-five years whilst the American supply is comparatively untried; expediency of trade being allowed to regulate itself as between the two modes of supply, 5510-5513. 5677-5684. 5769, 5770. 5777, 5778——Advantage in importing inferior cattle in order to meet the demand of the lower classes, 5513——Belief further expressed that a dead-meat supply from the Continent could not be calculated upon in lieu of the live animal supply, 5514-5516. 5617-5623.

Statement to the effect that offal cannot be sent from London into the country in hot weather, 5517, 5518——Greater expense in slaughtering at Deptford than on the butcher's premises, 5519, 5520. 5547——Very large business of witness in the live-cattle trade exclusively; if this were abolished he could enter into the dead-meat trade, 5523-5531——Further admission as to the excellent condition in which some of the American meat arrives, so that the whole supply may in time be placed on a satisfactory footing, 5532-5539. 5774.

Necessity of slaughtering at Deptford all the foreign cattle coming to London; belief that they must be slaughtered within ten days, 5540-5543. 5610——Several respects in which compulsory slaughter at Deptford tends to restrict the trade and to lessen the import, 5544-5551. 5589. 5594-5601——Consideration of exceptions taken to witness'

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Gebhardt, Herrman. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

view that foot-and-mouth disease occurs in this country, irrespectively of foreign import, 5552-5561.

Tendency of slaughter at the port to increase the price in England and to reduce it in France and Germany, 5562-5564. 5570-5580. 5590-5596——Very high prices realised by American beasts sent over alive, 5565-5569——Effect of slaughtering at Deptford in making meat dearer in the country, and, for a time, cheaper in London, 5573-5576. 5581-5589. 5689-5692. 5754. 5773.

Further statement as to the difficulties in sending dead meat throughout the year from London into the country, 5581-5587. 5655-5657——Probability of an increased number of buyers at Deptford if all the cattle coming into London went there to be slaughtered, 5597-5601——Explanation in further reference to the proposal that Islington market be used only for fat animals, and that all animals moved thence into the country should go under a killing license, 5602-5608.

Grounds for dissenting from the view that it would be feasible so to regulate a dead-meat trade as to prevent a glut in the market at some times and a scarcity at other times, 5609-5616——Smaller size of continental than American beasts, so that it would be more difficult to send the former in good condition as dead meat, 5618. 5620——Difficulty as to ice supplies on the Continent further adverted to, 5615. 5620. 5717-5720. 5726-5729——Difficulty also through the inability to dispose of the offal at the port of export, such as Tonning, 5618, 5619. 5721-5725——Less price to be realised by dead meat from the Continent than from America, 5621-5624.

Further statement as to the advantage of excluding cows from London dairies on the score of liability to pleuro-pneumonia, 5627-5629——Conclusion as to the better quality of country milk than of London milk, 5630-5632——Examination upon the question whether the price in Birmingham and other provincial towns has really been enhanced through the necessity of slaughtering foreign cattle at Deptford; tendency of the American supply to check increased prices, 5633-5647. 5696-5700.

Further reference to the comparatively inferior cattle taken from London for country and mining districts; explanation that the meat is sound and good, though the animals are small, 5648-5654——Doubt whether dead meat can be sent profitably from the west of Ireland to London, 5658——Heavy penalty upon foreign dealers in the loss incurred when they ship diseased animals which are subsequently slaughtered, 5659, 5660——Check by means of quarantine and inspection in England, as well as by inspection at the foreign port upon the introduction of cattle plague, 5660-5662.

Good meat supplied by the cattle imported from Prussia and Bavaria which have been used for ploughing, 5663-5666. 5711, 5712——Much lower price at which the poorer classes can buy offal than American meat, 5668, 5669——Due precautions now taken in Germany against the export of animals with cattle plague; sufficient security against its re-introduction into England, 5674-5677——Witness further contends that pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease are home diseases and are not imported, 5674. 5677. 5713-5715——Fairness in at least giving due notice to the foreigner before prohibiting import, 5677. 5769, 5770.

Modified success of dead meat imported from America, whilst but very little has yet come from elsewhere, 5702, 5703——Non-objection to the import of dairy cows into London, provided they are not sent to Islington market, 5704-5710——Full approval of the import of dead meat as one means of supply, 5716——Dissent from the view that gluts in the market may be obviated by certain precautions in connection with an extended dead-meat trade, 5730, 5731.

Expected import of cattle chiefly from Schleswig-Holstein in the summer months, 5732-5741——Large import of cattle and sheep to be obtained from Germany in the first six months of the year, 5733, 5734. 5739-5741——Discontinuance of import from France since the necessity of slaughtering at Deptford, 5735-5738.

Desire further expressed by witness for a modification of the present restrictions upon import as soon as they can be safely relaxed, 5745-5748——Opinion that an exclusively dead-meat trade could not be properly carried out even if American meat could be always supplied in good condition, without spoiling by keeping, 5749-5753.

Examination as to the relative price at which dead meat from America and cattle from the Continent can be sold to the public at a profit, and as to the extent of margin in favour of the former; doubt as to the American trade paying at 6 *d.* per pound, 5735-5768——Dislike of American meat in Birmingham and Manchester, so that it does not enter into competition with other meat as regards price, 5771-5776.

Approval of a fair trial being given to the American supply; large increase in the supply since the more stringent restrictions upon import from the Continent, 5777-5781——Probable reduction for a time in the price of meat by an increased import from America concurrently with the import of live stock, 5782-5785.

GERMANY:

Report, 1877—*continued.*

GERMANY:

1. *As to the Existence of Cattle Plague in Germany and the Restrictions enforced by the Imperial Government and the Local Authorities.*
2. *Arrangements for the prompt Transmission of Information to England.*
3. *Inspection.*
4. *Compensation and Cost of restrictive Measures.*
5. *Amount and Character of the Export to England.*
6. *Sheep.*
7. *Price of Cattle and Meat.*
8. *Pleuro-pneumonia and Foot-and-Mouth Disease.*
9. *Question of prohibiting Import of Live Cattle from Germany.*
10. *Recommendation by the Committee in favour of Prohibition.*

1. *As to the Existence of Cattle Plague in Germany and the Restrictions enforced by the Imperial Government and the Local Authorities:*

Detailed information respecting the progress of the cattle plague in Germany between January and March 1877; practical extirpation of the disease by 12th March, *Brown* 269–279——Conclusion that the disease has been certainly stamped out by means of severe regulations; the regulations are in fact far more severe than would be tolerated in this country, *ib.* 279–284. 290——Entire stoppage of movement throughout Germany; adoption also of a system of declaring a place infected for twenty kilometres round the seat of the disease, *ib.* 283, 284——Restrictions also as to the movement of people out of the infected circles, *ib.* 285–290.

Regulations now in force in Prussia with reference to the prevention of the introduction of cattle plague; prohibition by the German authorities of any treatment for cattle plague on account of the belief that no measure answers except stamping out, *Müller* 1349–1370. 1477. 1478. 1492–1498. 1509, 1510. 1530–1538. 1620–1624——Statement that the outbreak in Germany in the year 1872 was caused by smuggling diseased animals over the frontier to Breslau; considerable risk of this smuggling in Upper Silesia, *ib.* 1350–1354. 1371–1377. 1605–1611. 1623–1628——Total prohibition of importation of cattle from Russia into Germany; prohibition also of grey or steppe cattle from Austria, *ib.* 1351–1354.

Increased vigilance on the part of the German authority after the outbreak of 1872; appointment thereupon of veterinary inspectors and armed policemen, *Müller* 1358——Establishment of a census of cattle throughout the districts; the restriction as to movement of cattle, with reference to this census, confined only to cases of cattle plague, *ib.* 1358–1360. 1581–1588——Special permit required for the transmission of cattle by railway from certain border stations to the interior, *ib.* 1365–1368.

Export of cattle from all markets in Germany stopped when the central authority has been informed of a case of cattle plague in the border districts; opinion as to the efficacy of this arrangement, *Müller* 1368, 1369——Absence of restrictions upon the movement of store cattle throughout Germany, *ib.* 1370——Means adopted for the suppression of cattle plague when discovered; slaughter of all diseased animals, and of those which have come in contact with them, *ib.* 1386. 1388–1389. 1392, 1393——Diseased animals when slaughtered buried to the depth of two metres, *ib.* 1386. 1388, 1389.

Military cordon drawn round the Polish or Austrian frontiers when cattle plague exists in those districts, *Müller* 1392, 1393——Intention of the German authorities to construct slaughtering establishments on the frontier, and there to permit the slaughter of Austrian cattle under veterinary inspection, *ib.* 1401, 1402.

Severity of the last outbreak of cattle plague in Germany, *Müller* 1466–1468——Admittance permitted to the Berlin market of all cattle, though none are allowed to be moved away alive, *ib.* 1497, 1498 1564——Rinderpest unknown in Prussia except when introduced by foreign cattle, *ib.* 1524——Explanation of the danger which exists in Germany in regard to the great markets for slaughtering, *ib.* 1565.

Approval by the German farmers of the existing stringent regulations for the prevention of cattle plague, *Baron von Behr* 2481. 2485, 2486——Intention of the Government to make their restrictions more severe; strong opinion of witness in favour of increased severity of regulations, *ib.* 2482–2484. 2500–2505. 2547–2551——Information respecting the measures adopted by the Government for the purpose of stamping disease out of the country; severe punishments inflicted in the case of cattle smuggling into Germany, *ib.* 2483–2494. 2498–2511. 2547–2551.

Desire on the part of the Government to meet the wishes of England in regard to any restrictive measures having reference to cattle diseases, *Baron von Behr* 2492. 2510, 2511. 2517——Decided conviction that cattle plague is now completely stamped out in Germany; opening of the boundaries of neighbouring countries in consequence of the freedom from disease, *ib.* 2495–2497——Great difficulty for the German Government to prevent occasional smuggling somewhere on their extended frontier, *ib.* 2499–2504. 2598–2600——Expediency of making the law of disinfecting ships an Imperial law, applicable to the whole of Germany, *ib.* 2517–2519.

GERMANY—continued.

1. *As to the Existence of Cattle Plague in Germany, &c.*—coutinued.

Assertion that cattle plague is the only disease in Germany of paramount importance; insignificance of all other diseases in comparison, *Baron von Behr* 2533-2535. 2563-2565——Dissent from the opinion that cattle plague is introduced into England from Germany; difficult mission of the latter country to protect the whole of Europe against the introduction of the plague from Russia, *ib.* 2560, 2561——Wish on the part of the German farmer to co-operate with the English farmer with the object of conquering the frightful disease of cattle plague, *ib.* 2603.

2. *Arrangements for the prompt Transmission of Information to England:*

Existing regulations for the interchange of information with Germany respecting cattle plague; advantage of international arrangements on the subject, *Brown* 715-721. 743-752——Necessity for excluding German cattle from England, unless international arrangements can be made with Germany that her frontier will be closed against the introduction of Russian cattle; desirability of obtaining information as to the approach of the disease towards the German frontier, *Simonds* 1135-1139. 1145-1147.

Local authorities in Germany directed to dispatch to England immediate information of any outbreak of disease, *Baron von Behr* 2490, 2491. 2493.

Admission as to the decreased danger through the better telegraphic information promised from Germany, *Wilson* 4708-4714—— Facility of obtaining prompt information from Germany whenever cattle plague breaks out, so that any vessel on the route might be stopped in time, *Gebhardt* 5145-5147.

3. *Inspection:*

Information as to the composition of the veterinary staff in Germany; the most trustworthy of this staff are employed upon the Eastern frontier, from Memel on the Baltic to Upper Silesia, in consequence of that frontier being the most liable to the outbreak of cattle plague, *Müller* 1341-1348.

Further information as to the inspectors acting under regulations from the Central Department in Germany; in cases of pleuro-pneumonia they act under the authority of their own state, and not under the laws of the empire, *Müller* 1602-1604.

4. *Compensation and Cost of restrictive Measures:*

Compensation paid by the German Government to the full value of all the cattle slaughtered on account of cattle plague; less amount paid as compensation in the case of animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia, *Müller* 1379-1385. 1390, 1391. 1433-1438. 1511-1516 —— Cost of carrying out the regulations in regard to the suppression of cattle plague borne wholly by the Imperial Government, *ib.* 1379. 1395——Estimate of the expenses borne by the Government on account of the last outbreak of cattle plague; inclusion in this estimate of all cost of destruction of buildings and cost of burying, *ib.* 1410-1418.

Compensation paid by the Imperial Government to the extent of the whole value of slaughtered cattle in the case of rinderpest; expediency of the empire paying one half and the province the other half, *Baron von Behr* 2481. 2527, 2528. 2595-2597.

5. *Amount and Character of the Export to England:*

Unimportant effect at present of the stoppage of the German trade, as during this period of the year very few German cattle are imported, *Brown* 1071, 1072——Largest exports to England from Schleswig-Holstein, Oldenburg, and Madgeburg, in Saxony, *Müller* 1489—— Prohibition of importation of cattle to England from Germany at the present time; destination of the German cattle which would otherwise be sent to England, *ib.* 1539-1542.

Large import of German cattle and sheep into England; the best sheep, and probably the best cattle, are selected for exportation to England, *Baron von Behr* 2467-2471. 2556-2559.

Large decrease of late in the supply of cattle from Germany, *Gebhardt* 5213—— Good meat supplied by the cattle imported from Prussia and Bavaria which have been used for ploughing, *ib.* 5663-5666. 5711, 5712——Large import of cattle and sheep to be obtained from Germany in the first six months of the year, *ib.* 5733, 5734-5739-5741.

6. *Sheep:*

Statement as to sheep having been recently attacked with cattle plague, *Brown* 275-277—— Expediency of permitting sheep and swine to come from Germany without further restrictions than exist at present; the introduction of cattle plague has not been traced to these animals, *ib.* 380-384.

Considerable export of sheep from Germany to France, *Müller* 1542——Belief that if Germany were unscheduled the import of sheep to England would be very much increased, *ib.* 1563.

Small

GERMANY—continued.

6. *Sheep*—continued.

Small size of the sheep imported from Germany as compared with English sheep, *Gebhardt* 5462-5466——Enormous increase in the import of sheep from Germany for sale at Deptford, *Rudkin* 8933.

7. *Price of Cattle and Sheep:*

The price of meat in Germany is on the average 7 *d.* a pound for the best parts, *Baron von Behr* 2575-2577——Twofold increase in the value of land and live stock in North Germany in the last fifteen years, *Gebhardt* 5516.

8. *Pleuro-pneumonia and Foot-and-Mouth Disease:*

Pleuro-pneumonia dealt with in Prussia in the same way as cattle plague; prohibition of importation of cattle from the Netherlands, where this disease is rife, *Müller* 1426-1432. 1439-1444. 1499-1501.

Absence of stringent regulations for stamping out foot-and-mouth disease, inasmuch as the necessary measures would entail a greater loss than the disease itself; regulations now in force as to this disease, *Müller* 1445-1450. 1502. 1517-1519.

Difficulty of arriving at the best means of dealing with pleuro-pneumonia; divided opinion in Germany as to whether the disease has been imported or is indigenous, *Baron von Behr* 2520-2529. 2563. 2569——Unimportance of foot-and-mouth disease in Germany; opinion that this disease is more severe in highly fed than in poor cattle, *ib.* 2530-2532. 2538. 2542-2544. 2570-2574. 2585-2587.

9. *Question of prohibiting Imports of Live Cattle from Germany:*

Conclusion as to the necessity of excluding cattle from Germany in reference to cattle plague, *Brown* 314-344. 509-513. 699 *et seq.*; *Simonds* 1124-1129. 1147. 1190, 1191——Belief that from Germany we should get a very small proportion of dead meat as compared with the quantity of meat represented by live cattle, *Brown* 375-379.

Grounds for the belief that the exportation of live cattle from Germany to this country may be continued without peril, for slaughtering purposes, *Müller* 1421-1425. 1543-1548. 1617, 1618——Expediency of placing Germany in the same state as regards export of cattle to England, as she was before the outbreak of cattle plague, *ib.* 1543-1548.

Extract from a work by Herr von Bunsen showing the advantage of establishing free-trade in cattle; great advantage on the part of German farmers with reference to any restrictions on the export of cattle to England, *Baron von Behr* 2469-2471——Desirability of classifying German cattle in the same schedule as French and Spanish cattle, *ib.* 2591, 2592.

Liability to the import of cattle plague by Germany from Russia, and by England from Germany, in spite of the increased restrictions and precautions adopted, or professed to be adopted, by the latter country, *Wilson* 4701-4715——Further statement in favour of prohibiting import from Germany and Schleswig-Holstein in view of the existence of disease in those countries, *ib.* 4993 4997. 5007-5009.

Belief that if the increased restrictions proposed in Germany be properly carried out cattle plague could never escape out of the country, *Gebhardt* 5148-5150——Special interest of Germany in the suppression of cattle plague, oxen being used for ploughing, *ib.* 5151-5154——Stringent powers in the hands of the central authority, *ib.* 5154, 5155. 5165, 5166——Due precautions now taken in Germany against the export of animals with cattle plague; sufficient security against its re-introdnction into England, *ib.* 5674-5677.

Very little faith of witness in the restrictions imposed in Germany, *Odams* 7939. 7941——Little reliance to be placed on promised restrictions and precautions in Germany, *Read* 9567-9571. 9574——Import of disease from Germany at times when it was not reported as existing there, *Brown* 10054.

10. *Recommendation by the Committee in favour of Prohibition:*

Constant risk in the case of import from Germany on account of its long exposed frontier, *Rep.* iii——Recommended prohibition of import of cattle from Germany (except Schleswig-Holstein), *ib.* vi. ix.

See also *Cattle Plague. Dead Meat. Foot-and-Mouth Disease. Foreign Cattle. Hamburg. Hull. Manchester and Salford. Pleuro-pneumonia. Schleswig-Holstein.*

Giblett, John. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Long experience and large business of witness as a cattle salesman; very large consignments to him from France, Portugal, snd other countries, 6480-6483——Great falling off in the consignments of French cattle to witness since the restrictions in force as to slaughtering at Deptford, 6483-6497. 6624.

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Giblett, John. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

6733——Large import of live cattle from Spain and Oporto; particulars as to the very superior and healthy quality of these cattle, and as to the good prices realised, 6498-6504. 6564, 6565.

Grievance in the compulsory slaughter of Spanish and Portuguese cargoes at Deptford when one or two animals are reported as suffering from foot-and-mouth disease, 6505-6509, 6621. 6623. 6725, 6726——Increasing import of American live cattle *viâ* Southampton; very fine quality of these beasts and very high prices realised by them, 6510-6516. 6643, 6646. 6650, 6651. 6686-6690. 6708-6714——Extent and result of witness' experience in connection with dead meat from America; very indifferent condition in which several cargoes have arrived, and very low prices fetched as compared with the prices of American live stock, 6517-6555. 6691-6693.

Decided opinion that every facility should be given to the import both of live cattle and dead meat, 6524. 6569, 6769——Belief that the majority of those who try American dead meat have a distaste for it, 6536, 6537——Very bad appearance of the meat; statement hereon as to its being objected to by the army and navy and by prison and workhouse authorities. 6538-6542.

Grounds for the conclusion that dead meat will continue to be sent from America in large quantities during winter, but that in hot weather it cannot be sent without great loss, 6543-6557. 6638-6649. 6691-6693. 6739-6744. 6756-6760——Increasing price of cattle in the United States and Canada, 6546-6550. 6591-6595. 6654-6656. 6739——Great obstacles to a profitable trade in dead meat from Spain and Portugal, 6558-6563. 6666.

Approval of a strict prohibition of import from any country from which cattle plague may be brought, 6566-6568. 6588. 6719——Prevalence of foot-and-mouth disease in England long before any foreign cattle were imported, 6567. 6576, 6577. 6698-6700——Existence of this disease in nearly every country as well as in England, witness strongly disapproving of the restrictions in reference to the import of cattle affected with the disease, 6570. 6576-6579. 6615. 6626. 6725-6728——Belief as to the foot-and-mouth disease being atmospherical, 6570. 6679. 6683-6685. 6722-6724——Objection also to the prohibition of import from any country on the score of pleuro-pneumonia, 6571-6576. 6615.

Expediency of all regulations and restrictions resting with the Privy Council, 6579, 6580—— Concurrence in Mr. Gebhardt's suggestion that all animals moved from Islington Market into the country be marked for slaughter, 6581-6584. 6589, 6590——Exceedingly objectionable character of Deptford Market; the smells are abominable, and moreover witness hates covered markets, 6585-6587. 6633-6635. 6702. 6734, 6735.

Considerable and continuous rise in the price of meat, the increase of population and of demand being one cause, and the restrictions upon import of live stock another cause, 6596-6604. 6694. 6721——Effect of the increased price in inducing import of cattle and also of dead meat, 6605-6611——Belief that the total exclusion of foreign cattle would make meat fabulously dear, 6612-6614. 6752——Result of witness' experience that continental cattle have much less disease than English cattle, 6616-6622.

Way in which compulsory slaughter at Deptford has a very deterrent effect upon foreign import; great dislike of buyers to attend the market, 6627-6635. 6733-6735——Difficulty in the disposal of offal at Deptford, 6636, 6637——Excellent arrangements for bringing cattle from Oporto, 6640-6642——Statement as to the premature killing of home-bred cattle, instead of the calves being kept for stores, 6644. 6671-6674. 6766, 6767—— Very little dead meat from Aberdeen in the summer, 6648, 6649. 6681. 6682.

Advantage of supplies of American meat in the winter as an auxiliary to the live cattle supply, 6652, 6653——Uncertain profit realised by cattle from the Continent, 6657-6660——Advantage in importing cattle rather than dead meat from Holland, 6660-6663——Value of the live cattle from Spain and Portugal for the supply of army contracts, 6664-6670——Room for a large increase of home breeding; doubt as to this being checked by fear of disease being imported, 6671-6674. 6766-6769.

Good price obtained by the English farmer, notwithstanding the effect of the American meat supply, 6675-6678—— Conviction of witness that an entire exclusion of foreign cattle would never answer, 6680, 6681——Effect of the losses from rinderpest and other diseases in limiting the supply of cattle and in enhancing the price, 6695-6697——Considerable amount of foot-and-mouth disease among cattle from France; belief that this is largely engendered at Deptford, 6701-6707.

Exception taken to certain statistics as to the comparatively small import of foreign cattle in relation to the home supply generally; large import of the former into London, 6715-6718. 6763-6765——Reference to the total and heavy loss from cattle diseases, witness submitting, however, that foot-and-mouth disease is quite as much a native as a foreign complaint, and that animals do not die from it, 6719, 6720. 6727, 6728——

Effect

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Giblett, John. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

Effect of the charges of salesmen, middlemen, and others, in adding to the price of meat, 6729-6732.

Decided tendency to an increase of the dead-meat trade, the chief difficulty being when the weather is hot, 6736-6738——Further reference to the excellent quality of the American meat, though it sometimes comes in very bad condition, and is only suitable for a winter trade, 6740-6744——Depression in the prices of live cattle when dead meat comes in very large quantities, 6745, 6746——Continued import of American meat, notwithstanding the losses, as there are outstanding contracts, 6747.

Great importance of supplies of offal for the poorer classes, whereas offal cannot be imported in good condition, 6748-6751——Injury to witness' business by excluding foreign cattle; explanation hereon that he advocates the interests of importers in the matter, 6752-6755——Considerable inconvenience to salesmen and buyers through the markets being held on the same day at Deptford and Islington, 6770-6773.

Gillett, Murillo H. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Large experience of witness as a farmer and cattle breeder in America; he is now engaged as an American meat exporter, 2613-2618. 2627-2629——Details of the mode of feeding cattle in America which are intended for the market, 2619. 2624. 2818-2821——Average number of cattle which have passed through witness' hands annually in the States, 2621-2626.

Large development in the trade of dead meat from America since its commencement, 2629, 2630——Information respecting the process of preparing the meat for shipment; great care necessary in the refrigerating practice, 2631. 2640-2652. 2714-2718. 2775-2779. 2837-2840. 2851-2853——Manner of disposing of the offal of the cattle; hearts and livers only sold for food, 2631. 2665-2667. 2745-2750——Variation in quality as regards the cattle coming from different localities; best class of cattle exported to England as meat, 2632-2636.

Examination with reference to the price at which it will be necessary to sell the meat so as to make the trade remunerative; possibility of going as low as 5½ *d.* a pound, 2637-2639. 2693, 2694. 2700-2702. 2738-2744. 2760-2765. 2772-2774. 2814-2817. 2843-2846——Opinion that the meat will bear transit from the port of arrival to other markets without fear of deterioration from being exposed to a higher temperature than that of the refrigerator; this is conditional on the meat being properly prepared at first, 2642-2647. 2649-2652.

Argument that the fall in price of American meat in the English markets is due, not to deterioration of quality, but to the fact that the market was overstocked, 2654-2656——Absence of necessity for dead-meat stores, specially prepared, for carrying on the trade in the English markets, 2657, 2658——Statement that hot weather is in no way prejudicial to the meat, if it be properly prepared, 2659-2664.

Undoubted opinion that the dead-meat trade from America will become a permanent and regular business; belief that this meat can compete successfully with meat killed in this country, 2669-2673. 2695-2697. 2703-2707. 2757-2759. 2802-2804. 2828, 2829. 2841. 2842. 2853——The proportion of dead meat to the live animal is at the rate of about a ton of dead meat to three bullocks, 2674-2678——Explanation of the reason for sending the live cattle to New York instead of killing them and preparing them at Chicago, 2679-2689.

Gradual improvement of the herds of cattle in America by means of crossing the native cattle with English short-horns; opinion that the stoppage of importation from England will not have an injurious effect for the next three to five years, 2690, 2691. 2697. 2722-2733——Statement that the supply of meat from America may be considered to be practically unlimited, 2695-2699. 2751——Deterioration of some of the earlier cargoes of meat not on account of the hot weather, but because the machinery for regulating the temperature broke down in one instance, whilst in two instances sufficient ice had not been taken, 2706-2710.

Absence of difficulty in the transit of meat so far as the sea passage is concerned, 2712——Assertion that the meat if properly prepared will keep longer than any other meat killed in the ordinary way, either English or American, 2719-2721. 2759——Preference for the dead-meat trade to England as compared with the live stock trade; great risk attendant upon the latter during the winter, 2734 2737. 2760-2765.

Statement that 5 *d.* is the average price for prime beef in New York, 2742——Favourable experience as to the condition of the cargoes of dead meat shipped to Liverpool; certainty when the means of transit are more perfect of delivering meat in Liverpool as fresh as when it was killed in New York, 2752-2759——Sale of the offal in New York at an average price of 6 *s.* per bullock, 2761-2765.

Explanation with reference to several cargoes lately arrived in England in bad condition; defective preparation in America the real cause of this failure, 2766-2771. 2847-2850. 2854-2856——Necessity for refrigerators equally in winter as in summer; the temperature must not be too low when the meat is cooling, 2770. 2856——Carriage of

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Gillett, Murillo H. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

the meat ten miles to the place of shipment from the slaughter-house, 2775-2779——Large shipments, to the extent of 1,400 animals weekly, from New York, 2780-2782.

Further information relative to the refrigeration of the meat before shipment; supply of all necessary machinery and ice by the owner of the meat, 2783-2792——Non-variation of the rates of shipment from New York to England since the commencement of the dead-meat trade; the convenience for carrying dead meat is much greater than in the case of live animals, 2793-2804. 2861, 2862——Absence of any difficulty in finding markets for the meat on its arrival in Liverpool; meat occasionally sent to Manchester or Birmingham on account of its obtaining a better price, 2805-2809.

Statement that since the commencement of this trade seven per cent. would represent the loss by bad meat on the total shipments, 2810-2813——Possibility of sending pork and mutton in large quantities in the same way as beef, 2823-2827. 2858-2860——Method adopted by the butchers in New York for preserving the meat for daily use, 2830-2833.

Glanders. Reasons for not carrying out the recommendation of the Committee of 1873 with regard to glanders; difficulty which would arise in compensating for the slaughter of horses affected with the disease, *Brown* 1049, 1050——Compensation in the case of horses slaughtered for glanders in Germany, paid by the local authority to the amount of half the value, *Müller* 1451-1454——Difficulty as to the local authorities being empowered to inspect premises in reference to glanders or farcy, *Brown* 10197.

Regulations in the Animals Order of 1875 as to the course to be pursued in reference to glanders and farcy, *App.* 526, 527.

Glasgow. Great change in the trade in Glasgow since the cattle plague of 1865; large dead-meat market now in operation, *Hamilton* 4202. 4210-4212——Small proportion of the Glasgow supply, which consists of foreign cattle; the latter do not come at all in the winter months, *ib.* 4203-4207——Good condition in which the foreign cattle arrive, *ib.* 4208, 4209.

Undue detention of foreign cattle on board ship in Glasgow before their removal to feeding grounds, *Hamilton* 4249. 4259-4260——Necessity of live cattle as well as dead meat for the supply of the town; the former cannot be calculated upon in bad weather, *ib.* 4341-4344. 4357, 4358. 4375, 4376. 4392. 4404-4406——Estimate of the American dead meat supply at Glasgow as one-seventh of the whole supply, *ib.* 4352-4355.

See also *American Cattle*, 2. *American Dead Meat*, I., 2. V.

Gloucestershire. Explanation in connection with an order passed a few months ago by the quarter sessions in Gloucestershire, on the motion of witness, prohibiting the import of Irish cattle into the county, *Lord Fitzhardinge* 5256-5263. 5327-5337. 5340-5343——Extensive dairy district between Gloucester and Bristol, heavy losses being sustained by the farmers from foot-and-mouth disease imported by Irish cattle, *ib.* 5271-5274. 5287, 5288.

Circumstance of a cargo of Irish cattle having been landed at Sharpness Point twenty miles above Bristol, and afterwards driven to Bristol for sale, *Peters* 5359-5362. 5371-5374. 5384, 5385.

Action taken by the local authority of the county under the Cattle Plague Order of January 1877, *App.* 562.

See also *Bristol.*

Great Eastern Railway. Unduly high charges for carriage of dead meat over the Great Eastern Railway, *Read* 9561.

Great Western Railway. Details relative to the arrangements of the company for the carriage of dead meat, and the success thereof, *Sir C. A. Wood* 7360 *et seq.*——Large fish traffic from Kinsale conveyed successfully over the Great Western line, *ib.* 7383-7392.

Papers explanatory of the rates for fish traffic frrom Kinsale over the Great Western Railway from New Milford, *App.* 571-575.

See also *Dead Meat*, 8.

H.

Hall, Richard. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is a wholesale butcher in Livverpool largely interested in the supplying of shipping; also has large consignments of Canadian cattle, 2863-2865——Disapproval of the importation of American dead meat, especially with regard to supplies for shipping; statement that the action of the air upon this meat is highly prejudicial both to its appearance and quality, 2866-2872. 2881-2883. 2889, 2890. 2901-2903. 2945-2953.

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Hall, Richard. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

Stores opened in Liverpool for the sale of this meat, which though at first successful have been closed on account of the sale falling off; admission that many of the ordinary butchers subsequently took up this trade and sold the American meat beside their own, 2873-2876, 2926-2929. 2954-2956. 2959-2962——Statement that the price of large quantities of this meat in London has been as low as 2 *d.* and 3 *d.* a pound; the highest price has been 7 *d.*, but that was on account of the great scarcity of meat at the time, 2877, 2878. 2934. 2957, 2958. 2991-2997. 3010-3015. 3036-3038. 3041-3049.

Inferior condition of the meat resulting from the failure of ice in the vessels in hot weather, 2879-2881. 2963-2966——Admission that the introduction of this meat has been a great boon to the poor people who would have suffered greatly without it; opinion on the other hand that the richer classes would not touch it on account of its insipidity and want of flavour, 2881-2883. 2998. 3008, 3009. 3038-3040——Decided opinion that American beef will never be a substitute for English beef, 2883.

Evidence as to the advantage of live animals, in providing offal for the use of the poor; belief that offal can never be brought to this country from abroad and sold for consumption, 2885-2888. 2891-2895. 2973-2977. 2988——Circumstances under which witness declined to supply American meat to steamers; instances in which some steamers took their business away from witness on account of his adopting this course, and afterwards returned to him with larger orders for English meat, 2896-2899. 2945-2949. 2978-2980. 3022-3024.

Seizure in London, during the present week, of thirty tons of Canadian and American meat, 2899-2901. 3033-3035—— Dissent from the opinion of Mr. Gillett that the American dead meat trade will become established in England; decided preference for the live meat trade, 2904——Cargo of live cattle landed at Thames Haven in June 1876 from America, per the "Temperley" in magnificent condition; belief that there will be 20,000 imported into the United Kingdom in the present year, 2905-2910. 2939.

Comparative cost of importing live animals and dead meat into England; admission that the cost is greater in the former case, but the meat is much better, 2911-2920—— Statement that the ice used in the preservation of the meat is destructive to its flavour, 2911. 3016, 3017——Argument that the profits of the import of live cattle from America are sufficiently large to cover the possible losses which occur in rough weather, 2921, 2922. 2940-2942. 3007—— Expediency of treating Canada as a part of the United Kingdom, so long as no disease exists there, 2923.

Further examination with reference to the sale of American meat in Liverpool; instance of a butcher in Manchester buying tough and lean old cows and selling them for American meat in order to discredit the trade, 2930-2933. 3032——Larger commission paid upon dead meat than upon live animals, 2943, 2944——Comparison of the price of live stock from America with that of dead meat; advantage as regards cheapness in favour of the latter, 2970-2972.

Grounds for the opinion that if the importation of cattle into England from any part of the world were absolutely prohibited, it would be a very serious calamity, 2981-2986 ——Very great risk of importing partially diseased meat into England, if the importation of live stock be prohibited, 2989, 2990——Belief that American meat can never be imported into England as sound and good as English beef, 2998, 2999.

Dead loss to the importer of the meat which is selling at the present low prices, 3000-3006——Unwillingness of the owners of vessels to give the American meat to their own crews or passengers, 3019-3024——Objection to the meat on account of its soft and moist appearance, 3025-3031——Explanation as to the relative prices of meat sold wholesale and retail, 3043-3048——Further statement that the trade in American meat has considerably fallen off, 3053-3058.

Hamburg. Statement that the veterinary department at Hamburg is not under the control of the veterinary department at Berlin; regulations in Hamburg precisely the same as those in Prussia, *Müller* 1588-1590——Illustration of the laxity of inspection at Hamburg, *Read* 9570, 9571.

Hamilton, Archibald. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Long experience and large business of witness as a flesher in Glasgow; he has been deputed to represent the United Association of Fleshers in Glasgow, 4198-4201. 4304-4306.

Great change in the trade in Glasgow since the cattle plague of 1865; large dead meat market now in operation, 4202. 4210-4212——Small proportion of the Glasgow supply which consists of foreign cattle; the latter do not come at all in the winter months, 4203-4207——Good condition in which the foreign cattle arrive, 4208, 4209.

Large dealings of witness in dead meat from America, as consigned to Messrs. Bell & Sons; very good condition in which this meat arrives, whilst it will keep nearly as long as home-killed meat, though it loses colour, 4213-4247. 4277-4279. 4304-4315. 4325, 4326——Somewhat lower price realised by American than by home-killed meat, the former being readily bought by the public, 4232, 4233. 4309-4313. 4421-4431——

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Hamilton, Archibald. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

Statement showing that it is intended to permanently continue the American dead meat trade, 4235-4238. 4334-4339. 4385, 4386. 4416.

Undue detention of foreign cattle on board ship in Glasgow before their removal to feeding grounds, 4249. 4259, 4260——Very good condition in which the live cattle from America generally arrive at Glasgow, the meat being of excellent quality, 4250-4258——Obstacle to the profitable import of American live stock during the winter, 4252-4254.

Decided objection to the present restrictions in reference to foot-and-mouth disease, witness submitting that this disease is the direct result of cruelty and ill-usage, more especially on board the Irish boats, 4261-4273. 4280-4303. 4346-4351——Contagious character of foot-and-mouth disease, 4265, 4266——Approval of strict regulations for stamping out cattle plague and pleuro-pneumonia, but not foot-and-mouth disease, 4268-4273. 4299-4303——Facilities desirable for the removal of cattle suffering from foot-and-mouth disease to slaughter-houses, 4274-4276.

Particulars as to the crowded state of the Irish boats, and the defective arrangements generally for the care of the cattle, though some improvements have been made in the last few years; these boats are, in witness' opinion, the chief propagators of foot-and-mouth disease, 4280-4298. 4318-4324. 4346-4351. 4417-4420.

Fitness of the American dead meat for curing, 4314-4317——In cold weather meat can be kept for a fortnight or so, and in hot weather for about a week, 4329, 4330——Liability to great variation in the price of American dead meat in Glasgow, 4331-4340.

Necessity of live cattle as well as dead meat for the supply of Glasgow; the former cannot be calculated upon in bad weather, 4341-4344. 4357, 4358. 4375, 4376. 4392. 4404-4406——Estimate of the American dead meat supply at Glasgow as one-seventh of the whole supply, 4352-4355——Advantage in giving some rest and feeding to foreign cattle on arrival, before slaughtering them, 4359-4362——Necessity on only one occasion of selling a cargo of dead meat at a reduced price on account of its condition, 4363-4365.

Loss in importing dead meat instead of live cattle from Ireland, 4366-4373——Lower price, by 1 *d.* or 1½ *d.* per pound, of dead meat than of live cattle, 4368-4372. 4387-4396. 4407-4416——Relative cost of freight of live cattle and of dead meat; obstacle on this score to the profitable import of live cattle, save from America, 4377-4384. 4397-4403.

"*Hansa,*" *The.* See *Hull.*

Harwich. Complaint as to the laxity of the inspection at the port of Harwich, the inspector there not stopping animals which would be stopped in London, *Robinson* 8560-8566——Practice also in passing one or more cargoes before the expiration of twelve hours, *ib.* 8561.

Information as to the results of an official inquiry made in consequence of a complaint that the inspector at Harwich did not stop animals which would be stopped in London; the same practice was, in reality, pursued at both ports, *Brown* 9918-9925——Explanation in reference to a complaint that a cargo of cattle had been passed at Harwich in March 1874 before the twelve hours' daylight detention had expired, *ib.* 9908-9915——Explanation also as regards a statement by Mr. Robinson that some cattle landed at Harwich in October 1874, had been passed after sunset, *ib.* 9916, 9917.

Hides. Means of rendering the hides of diseased animals perfectly harmless by a preliminary process of dressing, instead of absolutely prohibiting their removal, *Brown* 178.

Highland Agricultural Association. Extracts from a recent memorial of the Association to the Privy Council advocating increased restrictions on the import of foreign cattle, *Smith* 8430, 8431——Importance attached by the Association to the establishment of a dead meat trade, *ib.* 8430.

Views of witness as representing the Association, to the effect that all foreign cattle should be slaughtered at the port of debarkation, and that store stock should be excluded, *Smith* 8433-8441. 8460-8488. 8490-8495.

HOLLAND:

1. *Regulations and Restrictions for the Suppression of Cattle Plague, Pleuro-Pneumonia, and Foot-and-Mouth Disease.*
2. *Amount of Disease in the Country; Question of prohibitting Import into England.*
3. *Question of a Dead Meat Trade.*
4. *Number and Class of Cattle in Holland.*
5. *Practice as to Compensation in cases of Cattle Plague.*

1. *Regulations and Restrictions for the Suppression of Cattle Plague, Pleuro-Pneumonia, and Foot-and-Mouth Disease:*

Information as to the laws and regulations in Holland with respect to the cattle plague; the legislation is founded chiefly on the law of the 20th July 1870, which corresponds with

Report, 1877—*continued.*

HOLLAND—continued.

1. *Regulations and Restrictions for the Suppression of Cattle Plague, &c.*—contd.

with the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act of this country, *May* 2012-2028. 2037-2040. 2074-2079. 2093, 2094. 2109-2112. 2120——Summary of the measures adopted when cattle plague breaks out, *ib.* 2016——Regulations for prohibiting the importation and movement of cattle through the country; dispensatory power given to the Minister of the Interior to modify these regulations when necessary, *ib.* 2017. 2116-2119.

Disinfection of the railway trucks used in the conveyance of cattle entering Holland from foreign countries, *May* 2018——Practice as to the inspection of cattle before being shipped for foreign countries, *ib.* 2020. 2054-2058. 2076——Closing of the markets upon the outbreak of cattle plague in Germany in 1873; *ib.* 2024, 2025——Entire prohibition of the import of cattle into Holland at the present time; military forces sent to the frontier to enforce this regulation, *ib.* 2026, 2027.

Explanation of the course adopted in Holland with reference to pleuro-pneumonia; treatment of this disease by means of inoculation, the cost of which is borne by the State, *May* 2028-2036. 2053-2058. 2086-2092. 2099-2105. 2119. 2121-2127——Considerable diminution in the number of cases of pleuro pneumonia since the adoption of the slaughter of suspected animals; strong hopes that this disease will be effectually stamped out, *ib.* 2033-2036. 2048. 2138.

Measures applicable to foot-and-mouth disease; statement that this disease is not looked upon with the same alarm as it is in England, *May* 2075-2079. 2095-2098. 2106-2108. 2110, 2111. 2139-2143.

More effectual system lately adopted in Holland for suppressing pleuro-pneumonia, *Read* 9765-9769——Effect of the restrictions enforced in Holland as regards the suppression of pleuro-pneumonia, *Brown* 9897-9901.

Sundry decrees and other papers submitted by Mr. May explaining in detail the regulations adopted from time to time in the Netherlands in reference to pleuro-pneumonia, foot-and-mouth disease, &c., *App.* 578-585.

2. *Amount of Disease in the Country; Question of prohibiting Import into England:*

Holland should be scheduled until quite free from disease, *Brown* 822——Extent of import of disease into London by means of cows from Holland, *Pool* 5905-5914——Infection of Holland through having imported foreign cattle, or through mediate contagion, *Gamgee* 7081-7085. 7109, 7110——Objection to the import of live stock from Holland, notwithstanding the precautions in that country against disease, *ib.* 7145-7149.

Prevalence of pleuro-pneumonia in Holland, *Odams* 8029——Expediency of restricting rather than prohibiting the import of Dutch cows, *Odams* 8054; *Read* 9504, 9505. 9513——Liability to the import of pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease by means of Dutch cows; very strict quarantine required, *Robinson* 8610-8617.

Belief as to the impracticability of guarding against the import of disease with Dutch cows; expediency of excluding them altogether, *Melvin* 8909, 8910; *Tisdall* 9376 *et seq.*——Very unsatisfactory experience of witness as regards Dutch store cattle; very few of these now in Norfolk, *Read* 9774, 9775.

Number of cases of pleuro-pneumonia in each of the years 1871-76; great decrease since the former year, *App.* 511.

3. *Question of a Dead Meat Trade:*

Impression that it would be extremely difficult to establish a dead meat trade with the Netherlands, because of the extra expense to which the senders would be put, *May* 2059-2065——Statement as to the markets to which cattle would be sent from the Netherlands if the exportation to England were prohibited, *ib.* 2128-2130——Advantage in importing cattle rather than dead meat from Holland, *Giblett* 6660-6663.

Particulars as to the dead meat trade from Holland during the restrictions upon import of live stock in 1866; much smaller import of dead meat than of live animals, when the latter were not prohibited, *Robinson* 8567-8578——Occasional deterioration in the dead meat formerly brought from Holland; no ice was then used, *ib.* 8690-8692——Saving in the freight of dead meat, as compared with live cattle, from Holland, *ib.* 8696.

4. *Number and Class of Cattle in Holland:*

Returns of the numbers of cattle in Friesland as compared with the rest of the country, *May* 2046-2048——Occasional importation of breeding bulls for the purpose of improvement of stocks, *ib.* 2131——Decided opinion that if the import of live stock from the Netherlands were entirely prohibited, it would tend materially to diminish the raising of stock in that country, *ib.* 2065-2067. 2113, 2114.

Total of about 1,500,000 as the whole stock of cattle in the country, *Read* 9501.

HOLLAND—continued.

4. *Number and Class of Cattle in Holland*—continued.

Return of the number of cattle, sheep, swine, &c., in each of the provinces of the Netherlands in 1875, *App.* 511.

5. *Practice as to Compensation in cases of Cattle Plague:*

Compensation in respect of cattle plague paid out of the Imperial Treasury; compensation in the case of suspected animals given to the full value, and in that of diseased animals half value, *May* 2041–2045. 2080–2085.

See also *Cattle Plague.* *Cows.* *Dairies and Cowsheds.* *Dead Meat.* *Foot-and-Mouth Disease.* *Foreign Cattle.* *Hull.* *Quarantine.*

HOME SUPPLY:

Very large increase anticipated in the home supply in substitution for the foreign supply, if live cattle from abroad be prohibited; great scope for such increase, *Booth* 2347–2349; *Stratton* 6799-6804. 6808. 6837, 6838; *Odams* 8009. 8010. 8083–8091——Tendency of the fear of disease to keep down the home stock, and consequently the supply of meat to the country; illustration in witness' case, *Rea* 3588. 3591. 3602–3606. 3783–3787——Belief that if foreign import be stopped it will be quite possible to supply the deficiency by home produce, *ib.* 3607 *et seq.*; 3759–3763. 3799. 3800.

Effect of the cattle plague of 1865 upon witness' occupation as a breeder of cattle; in the absence of proper steps to protect the farming interest from cattle plague, witness will stock more with sheep than with cattle, *Rea* 3313–3329. 3806–3808——Argument that the outbreak of cattle plague has affected the supply of cattle in the future as well as at the present time, on account of the loss of breeding cows, *ib.* 3656–3659.

Calculation that there are a million less cattle in the country than before the outbreak of 1865, *Wilson* 4738–4741. 4970, 4971——Very prejudicial effect of the risk of disease in preventing or checking the breeding of stock in the country; illustration on this point, *ib.* 4799-4803. 4933–4936——Respects in which the farmer, as well as the nation, will be much better off for the stoppage of foreign import and the avoidance of disease; tendency to a large increase of breeding and of store cattle, *ib.* 4918–4920. 4925–4930. 4960, 4961——Degree of loss to the consumer; that is, through the decreased supply of cattle in the country, *ib.* 4970–4974.

Opinion that there is no scope for a large increase in the home supply of cattle, foreign cattle being excluded, *Gebhardt* 5237–5239——Belief that the grazing power of the country is already fully taxed, *ib.* 5237–5339——Less dependence on foreign supplies if farmers in England had increased their stocks, instead of growing so much corn and other produce, *Pool* 5835–5838——Room for a large increase of home breeding; doubt as to this being checked by fear of disease being imported, *Giblett* 6671-6674. 6766–6769.

Tendency to an increase of home stocks in the districts round Leeds, *Walker* 7918–7922——Considerable decrease in the amount of stock in this country, owing very much to the apprehension of disease, *Odams* 7947-7956——Progressive increase expected in the stock of cattle in England, but for the risk of disease, *ib.* 8083–8091.

Effect of disease in discouraging cattle breeding among English farmers; advantage to Irish farmers in proportion, *Howard* 8177–8180. 8334. 8339. 8422——Capacity of the country for, and probability of more extensive breeding, if security against disease were greater, *ib.* 8184–8187. 8335–8339.

Considerable decrease since 1865 in the number of English cattle and sheep sent to London, whilst the foreign supply has largely increased, *Rudkin* 8937–8941——Increase of home breeding and probable reduction of price, if foreign cows were excluded, *Tisdall* 9416–9418——Grounds for the conclusion that a much larger number of cattle would be bred in England if there were security against the import of disease, *Read* 9756, 9757.

Conclusion of the Committee as to the large increase of home breeding, if there were immunity from pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease, *Rep.* iv.

See also *Calves.* *Cattle Plague.* *Dead Meat.* *Farmers.* *Metropolitan Cattle Market.* *Price of Meat.*

Howard, James. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Has been deputed to represent the Central Farmers' Club; farms his own property in Bedfordshire, and has for many years taken a great interest in the subject of cattle diseases, 8145–8151. 8211.

Very heavy losses of witness from foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia, 8152. 8160, 8161——Introduction of foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia through fairs, 8153–8155——Very many animals attacked by these diseases in Bedfordshire about 1872, and heavy loss in consequence; exemption from cattle plague in the county, 8156–8165——Stringent regulations adopted for stamping out the outbreak; prohibition

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Howard, James. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

prohibition of fairs and markets temporarily, 8166–8174——Foot-and-mouth disease soon re-introduced, 8175, 8176.

Benefit derived from the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869; 8177, 8178——Effect of disease in discouraging cattle breeding among English farmers; advantage to the Irish in proportion, 8177–8180. 8334. 8339. 8422——Preference of farmers for production of wool and mutton; 10,000,000 or 11,000,000 home produced sheep slaughtered last year, 8181–8183——Capacity of the country for, and probability of, more extensive breeding if security against disease were greater, 8184–8187. 8335–8339.

Opinion of witness, speaking on behalf of the Farmers' Club, that farmers would submit to more stringent regulations with a view to stamping out disease, but that it would be re-introduced unless foreign cattle were excluded, 8188–8190. 8197–8199. 8398–8400.——Belief in the germ theory, 8190. 8196. 8260. 8360, 8361. 8389——Grounds for the conclusion that pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease are not produced spontaneously in England, but come from abroad; neither of these diseases in this country formerly, 8191–8196. 8411–8413.

Examination as to the scheduling system; evidence in favour of all fat cattle being slaughtered at the port of entry, 8200, 8201. 8251–8255. 8269, 8270. 8310–8325. 8405–8410——Free trade principles cheerfully accepted by English farmers; natural desire, however, for security from disease, 8202, 8203. 8371. 8392, 8393.

Views of witness as regards the dead meat trade; grounds for the conclusion that cattle are brought over in better condition dead than alive, 8204–8210. 8306–8312. 8326–8329. 8381–8386. 8419, 8420——General consideration of the means by which disease may best be restricted; various regulations suggested by witness on the part of the Farmers' Club, for both home and foreign stock, 8211 *et seq.*

Advisability of uniformity in local regulations and of Privy Council Orders being imperative, 8212. 8222, 8223. 8226–8228. 8236. 8287–8290. 8297——Proposal that the borough and county police should administer the Act and be constituted inspectors, with liberty to obtain veterinary aid; veterinary inspectors unnecessary, 8213–8221. 8224–8227.

Question of compensation considered; opinion that the public should pay to prevent concealment of disease, 8229–8234——Grounds for advising that cattle dealers be licensed, and also drovers at fairs and markets; proposed exemption in favour of labourers on individual farms, 8237–8242. 8291–8293.

Discussion of the measures desirable as regards cattle imported from Ireland; regulations suggested by witness to be enforced there as well as in England, 8243 *et seq.*——Foot-and-mouth disease regularly introduced from Ireland; Irish beasts depreciated in consequence, 8249. 8380.

Quarantining discussed; suggestion that store stock be not sent into the country until quarantined for two months, 8256–8272. 8294–8296. 8314. 8373–8377——Separate markets advised for home and foreign cattle; they should be easily accessible, whereas Deptford needs much improvement in this respect, 8273–8278——Reasons for altogether stopping the importation of store stock into this country from Ireland, whenever diseases exist there; the Irish would then take vigorous measures to stamp them out, 8279–8281. 8340, 8341. 8379.

Conviction of witness that disease should be dealt with immediately, and stamped out by strict measures, which he considers might be easily done, 8282–8286. 8390. 8394–8407. 8414–8418——Witness would let Ireland continue to have power to shut her ports against English cattle, 8298, 8299——No pleuro-pneumonia or foot-and-mouth disease in certain parts of Ireland and Scotland; that is, where cattle are exported only without any import, 8303–8305.

Reduction of price and considerable benefit to the community, if increased quantities of dead meat be imported from America, 8307–8309——Numbers of pigs bred by witness and exported to the Continent and Ireland in order to improve the breeds for the London market, 8313——Healthy state of the county of Bedford, and of England generally at the present time, 8330, 8331. 8354–8359.

Reasons for concluding that small farmers in Ireland would not be much interfered with by the proposed restrictions, 8342–8351——Possibility of smuggling being resorted to in the event of special restrictions; no practical danger on this score, 8367–8372——Necessary defects of inspection from its being so brief, 8378——Great capabilities of America to supply meat, though not in unlimited quantity, 8391.

HULL:

Explanations in connection with the outbreak of cattle plague consequent upon the cargo landed at Hull from Russia in July 1872, although all the animals were slaughtered, *Brown* 14, 15——Improved arrangements contemplated by the authorities at Hull; omission hitherto at this port to remedy certain defects, *ib.* 37–40.

Report, 1877—*continued.*

HULL—continued.

Precautions taken at Hull as regards the cargo of diseased cattle brought over in the "Hansa," *Brown* 87——Discovery of cattle plague in the dairies at Hull on the 17th February 1877; difficulty in tracing this outbreak, *ib.* 119–122——Action of the Privy Council and of the local authorities, the disease having been finally suppressed in the dairies on the 22nd March, *ib.* 123–129——Great danger of propogating the disease by the habitual purchase of hay and straw from the cattle ships by the dairymen in Hull; the outbreak of February was solely in the dairies, *ib.* 126–131.

Comment upon the course pursued by Mr. Duguid in the reported outbreak at Hull, in May 1877, and the conclusions drawn by him; slaughter of a herd of five cows upon his decision formed in a single case, witness greatly doubting whether there was any cattle plague at all, *Brown* 222–228. 237–243——Additional information respecting the alleged outbreaks of cattle plague; examination in reference to the measures adopted, *ib.* 501–503. 798–801. 879. 880. 1012–1026.

Further admission as to the important improvement proposed in the arrangements at the port; readiness shown by the authorities to adopt the suggestions made by the Privy Council, *Brown* 1006–1011. 1084–1087.

Very large import of cattle, sheep, and swine into Hull, *Brown* 1088, 1089——Improvement if cattle did not come in the same ships with passengers, *ib.* 1090–1093.

Great falling off in the import of foreign cattle into the port since the restrictions imposed in January 1877, witness and other Leeds butchers no longer obtaining supplies from the Hull market, *Walker* 7774–7788. 7896–7902——Diversion of trade to Newcastle since the restrictions at Hull, *Walker* 7781. 7843; *Knowles* 9233. 9352.

Witness submits that the prohibition of import of live cattle from Germany and Holland into Hull has caused great inconvenience and injury, not only to that port, but to Sheffield, Leeds, and other large towns previously supplied with live animals from Hull, *Knowles* 9226 *et seq.*——Very few cattle imported from Denmark, *ib.* 9228, 9229. 9295.

Calculation that there is an extra expense or loss of about 1 *l.* on each bullock sent from Hull to Leeds or Sheffield in the form of dead meat, instead of alive, *Knowles* 9237–9246. 9296–9302. 9343–9347——Difficulty as to the supply of dead meat from abroad to the large fleet of fishing smacks at Hull, *ib.* 9248–9254.

Claim on the part of Hull to the same privileges in regard to import from Schleswig-Holstein as are allowed in the case of Deptford Market; examination hereon relative to the markets at Hull and the steps taken, or being taken, to satisfy the requirements of the Privy Council, *Knowles* 9255–9264. 9282, 9283. 9317–9328. 9355–9359.

Very few Dutch cows lately imported into Hull, *Knowles* 9783–9785——Effect of the restrictions at Hull in raising the price of middle-class meat, on account of German cattle being excluded; difficulty especially as to supplies to shipping, *ib.* 9333–9342. 9348–9354.

Comment on the action of the local authorities in Hull in reference to precautions against the spread of disease, *Read* 9525–9529.

See also *American Cattle*, 2. *American Dead Meat*, V. *Cattle Plague. Foreign Cattle. Freights. Leeds.*

Import of Live Stock. See *American Cattle. Canada. Cattle Plague. Dead Meat. Denmark. Deptford Market. Farmers. Foot-and-Mouth Disease. Foreign Cattle. Free Trade. Freights. Germany. Holland. Home Supply. Hull. Inspection. International Arrangements. Ireland, &c., 6. Leeds. Liverpool. Newcastle. Pleuro-pneumonia. Ports. Price of Meat. Quarantine. Russia. Schleswig-Holstein. Scotland. Sheep. South America. Spain and Portugal. Store Cattle.*

Incubation of Disease. See *Cattle Plague*, 9. *Pleuro-pneumonia*, 2. *Quarantine.*

Infected Areas. Explanation in connection with two Orders issued by the Privy Council since the last outbreak of cattle plague in Bethnal Green; particulars more especially as to the establishment of an "infected area" by the Order now in force, and as to the advantages of this mode of restricting movement, *Brown* 10319–10329——Question considered whether the Privy Council has power to establish "infected areas" throughout the country as well as in the metropolis; expediency of amended and large powers in the matter, *ib.* 10330–10341. 10401–10403.

Recommendation by the Committee that in case of pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease breaking out, the Privy Council should have power to fix the limits of the district which is to be treated as infected, *Rep.* ix.

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Inoculation. Advocacy of inoculation in the case of animals that show no sign of pleuro-pneumonia, but have been in association with those that have had it, *Brown* 554—— Entire failure of inoculation for the prevention of cattle plague, *Simonds* 1200——Unfavourable opinion of witness as to inoculation as a prevention of pleuro-pneumonia, notwithstanding that many men of high standing approve of the system, *Müller* 1441, 1442.

Explanation in regard to the adoption of inoculation in Holland as a preventive of pleuro-pneumonia; belief that an animal which once has had this disease will not take it again, *May* 2086–2092. 2099–2105. 2121–2124——Decided opinion that inoculation should be compulsory when pleuro-pneumonia breaks out in a dairy stock, *Lambert* 3945–3950. 4035.

Suggestions for a trial of inoculation as a preventive in cases of pleuro-pneumonia; difficulty at present in forming conclusions as to the success of this treatment, *Brown* 10067. 10122–10126.

INSPECTION:

1. *Operation of the present System of Inspection, in reference to Cattle Diseases; its Efficiency, or otherwise.*
2. *Question of Inspection at the Port of Embarkation.*
3. *Staff: Question of Appointment by Government, or by Local Authorities.*
4. *Suggested Employment of the Police.*
5. *Conclusions of the Committee.*

1. *Operation of the present System of Inspection, in reference to Cattle Diseases; its Efficiency, or otherwise:*

Opinion that the present system of inspection is sufficient to guard against foot-and-mouth disease, by reason of the short period of incubation; belief that the inspection is conscientiously performed, *Brown* 49, 50——Statement that in some particulars, the instructions given to the inspectors were more stringent than were necessary, in order to make sure of preventing the spread of disease, *ib.* 178, 179.

Questionable advantage in the system of inspection at the ports as carried out at present; greater importance of detecting the disease at its centre of origin by means of inspectors, and preventing the movement of diseased animals from the centres, *Brown* 927–933. 940–942.

Unsatisfactory character of the inspection of foreign animals; probability that a larger number of diseased animals escape detection than are discovered, *Booth* 2392–2400 ——Doubt as to the value of inspection before the vessel comes into port, *Wilson* 4826—— Check by means of quarantine and inspection in England, as well as by inspection at the foreign port, upon the introduction of cattle plague, *Gebhardt* 5660–5662.

Reference to the case of the "Castor" as illustrating the inefficiency of inspection, *Adams* 7938. 8071–8074—— Statement as to foot-and-mouth disease having been detected in some Danish cattle landed at Newcastle after they had been passed a first inspection, *ib.* 7941–7943. 8078–8082——Necessary defects of inspection from its being so brief, *Howard* 8378.

Evidence purporting to show the entire inadequacy of inspection as a protection against the import of cattle with foot-and-mouth disease, *Robinson* 8559–8562——Complaint as to the uncertain and unequal character of the inspection at different ports; laxity at Harwich, *ib.* 8560–8566——Greater stringency in London than at the outports, *ib.* 8560.

Little, if any, reliance to be placed upon inspection, whether local or central, as a means of guarding against the import of disease, *Read* 9495–9497.

Much larger import of diseased animals but for the system of inspection at the port of arrival, *Brown* 9908—— Statement to the effect that the Government inspectors at ports, such as Bristol, where Irish cattle are landed, are empowered merely to report disease to the local authority, and to the Privy Council, without compelling immediate slaughter of the diseased animals, *ib.* 9938–9954——Opinion that absolute security against the introduction of disease cannot be obtained by any precautions, however strict, *ib.* 10045—— Inadequacy of inspection as a means of preventing the import of diseased cattle, *ib.* 10094, 10095.

2. *Question of Inspection at the Port of Embarkation:*

Grounds for the conclusion that it would be very unwise for the Privy Council to appoint inspectors at the port of embarkation abroad, *Brown* 868–876. 9926–9929—— Concurrence in the view that it is not desirable to appoint inspectors at the ports of embarkation, *Rea* 3471, 3742; *Wilson* 4830–4832.

Suggestions as to the means to be adopted in England to avoid the importation of disease; desirability of appointing English veterinary inspectors at Continental ports with instructions to telegraph information of shipment of infected animals, *Baron von Behr* 2512–2516. 2552–2555. 2566–2568. 2593, 2594.

Inspection—continued.

3. *Staff; Question of Appointment by Government or by Local Authorities:*

Advantage of the central authority having the appointment of all inspectors throughout the country, *Brown* 168——Proposed division of the whole country into districts, an inspector being placed in charge of each, who should be in constant communication with the central department, *ib.* 309, 310——Expediency of adopting uniformity of action by means of Government inspection, *ib.* 763-770. 802.

Recommendation that the Government should take the question of restriction entirely into their own hands and supersede the local authorities; expediency of the cost of inspection throughout the country being borne by Imperial instead of local funds, *Booth* 2302. 2430–2437——Belief as to the willingness of the local authorities to concur in the appointment of inspectors by the central authority, *Wilson* 4761–4763. 4941——Comparatively small increase of charge for inspection in order to apply more efficient precautions, *ib.* 5075, 5076.

Suggestions by the Central Chamber of Agriculture on the subject of local and itinerant inspection, *Stratton* 6788.

Entire readiness of the local authorities to submit to a system of Government inspection; considerations as to the source of payment of the increased staff required, *Stratton* 6791-6798. 6867——Contemplated appointment of local inspectors by the local authorities, *Soulby* 7248–7253; *Brown* 10182–10185——Sufficient powers already of the Privy Council as to the appointment of inspectors in case of need, *Soulby* 7254, 7255——Suggestion that the cost of inspection be borne by Imperial funds, *Smith* 8477–8479.

Suggested appointment of travelling inspectors for the supervision of the local arrangements, *Melvin* 8809–8811—— Contemplated appointment of the local inspectors by the local authorities, *ib.* 8811——Opinion that the appointment of inspectors should rest with the central authority, *Tisdall* 9421–9423.

Objection to the local inspectors being appointed by the Privy Council, *Read* 9610. 9631, 9632. 9752—— Advantage of travelling Government inspectors for seeing that the local authorities do their duty, *ib.* 9609-9611. 9613, 9614. 9631, 9632. 9752.

Exception taken to a suggestion for the appointment of a staff of travelling inspectors, *Brown* 10053, 10054——Importance of a staff of competent professional men for the prompt identification of disease throughout the country before any action is taken, *ib.* 10449. 10452.

4. *Suggested Employment of the Police:*

Advantage of employing the police throughout the country as inspectors under the local authority, *Brown* 524–526——The superintendents of police might act as inspectors, *Soulby* 7252.

Proposal that the borough and county police should administer the Act and be constituted inspectors, with liberty to obtain veterinary aid; veterinary inspectors unnecessary, *Howard* 8213–8221. 8224-8227—— Value attached to the services of the police in aid of the inspection both in London and the country, *Brown* 10447, 10448.

5. *Conclusions of the Committee:*

Conclusion as to the insufficiency of the check by means of inspection at the ports, *Rep.* iv. vi.

Different views submitted to the Committee upon the question of appointment of inspectors, *Rep.* v——Opinion of the Committee that the Privy Council could not undertake the work of local inspection throughout the kingdom, and that the appointment of inspectors should rest with the local authority, subject to the supervision of the Privy Council, *ib.*

See also *Bristol. Cattle Plague. Dairies and Cowsheds. Entry upon Premises. Germany*, 3. *Harwich. Ireland and Irish Cattle*, 4. *Pleuro-pneumonia*, 2. *Privy Council.*

International Arrangements. Evidence as to the advantage of international engagement in regard to the importation of cattle, *Brown* 715–722. 743–752——Desirability of trusting to international communications to prevent disease from spreading, and at the same time of removing the existing restrictions upon import, *Swan* 1689, 1690. 1701——Recommendations as to the arrangements necessary for governing the foreign importation of cattle; advantage of extending international regulations as regards telegraphing the announcement of the outbreak of disease, *Lambert* 3917–3921.

Expediency of international arrangements with a view to immediate intelligence by telegraph when there is an outbreak of cattle plague abroad, *Rep.* iii.

See also *Cattle Plague*, 6. *Germany*, 2.

Report, 1877—*continued.*

IRELAND, AND IRISH CATTLE:

1. *Transit of Live Stock to England; Defects of the Arrangements, and Cruelties practised, greatly to the Deterioration of the Animals, and the Development of Disease.*
2. *Cattle Boats; Extent to which productive of Disease.*
3. *Scheme of Sir C. A. Wood for amended Transit Arrangements.*
4. *Inspection.*
5. *Proposed Restrictions upon Movement of Cattle in Ireland; similar Regulations desirable for Ireland and England.*
6. *Import into Ireland.*
7. *Store Cattle.*
8. *Pleuro-pneumonia.*
9. *Foot-and-Mouth Disease.*
10. *Generally, as to the Amount of Disease in Ireland.*
11. *Great Increase in the Value of Live Stock.*
12. *Question of a Dead-meat Trade with England.*
13. *Recommendations by the Committee.*

1. *Transit of Live Stock to England; Defects of the Arrangements, and Cruelties practised, greatly to the Deterioration of the Animals, and the Development of Disease:*

Considerable deterioration formerly in the condition and value of Irish oxen during the transit to England, *Sir C. A. Wood* 7344——Result of an inquiry by witness into the shipment of cattle from Cork and Waterford, that disease is largely impregnated in the hay-fields, and that waterside depôts are much required, *ib.* 7345–7347. 7446——Opinion that disease is imported less from abroad than from Ireland, on account of the bad treatment of Irish cattle in transit, *ib.* 7355.

Great cruelty towards cattle and pigs in the act of embarkation at Irish ports, and in their removal into railway trucks at the English ports, *Sir C. A. Wood* 7402–7407——Less careful conduct of the cattle trade with Ireland than with the Continent, *ib.* 7413–7419——Varying distances for which the cattle travel to the port of shipment in Ireland; practice of placing them in lay-fields at the port, *ib.* 7430–7433——Development of disease during the transit to England, *ib.* 7454–7460.

Suggestion that cattle from Ireland be rested at the port of debarkation for six hours, and be fed and watered before and after leaving the railway trucks, *Read* 9611, 9612. 9692–9695. 9731–9734——Considerable improvement in the state of the lairs in Ireland, *ib.* 9611.

Urgent want of improved arrangements in the transit of Irish cattle; development of disease by the neglect and cruelty under the present system, *Odams* 8018–8025. 8028–8030. 8114, 8115——Comparative condition in which cattle arrive from Ireland and from the Continent, *ib.* 8116–8119.

Very rude arrangements formerly in the transport of live stock from Ireland, but without any outbreak of disease; greatly improved arrangements now in force, *Robinson* 8619, 8620——Belief that diseases are not developed during the transit from Ireland, but by subsequent treatment in England; very strict checks upon the shipment of diseased animals, *ib.* 8621–8625.

2. *Cattle Boats; Extent to which productive of Disease:*

Particulars as to the crowded state of the Irish boats and the defective arrangements generally, for the care of the cattle, though some improvements have been made in the last few years; these boats are, in witness' opinion, the chief propagators of foot-and-mouth disease, *Hamilton* 4280–4298. 4318–4324. 4346–4351. 4417–4420——Tendency of the bad arrangements on board the Irish cattle ships to promote foot-and-mouth disease, *Lord Fitzhardinge* 5303, 5304——Very crowded state of the Irish cattle boats; tendency to disease thereby, whilst many animals die on the voyage, *Peters* 5375–5379. 5386–5389.

Constant introduction of foot-and-mouth disease into Wiltshire by Irish cattle, *viâ* Bristol; belief that this is chiefly owing to the infected state of the vessels in which the cattle are brought from Ireland, and that the evil may be prevented by careful disinfection, *Stratton* 6839–6845. 6855–6861.

Circumstances under which witness made some investigations in 1864 into the mode of shipment of cattle from Irish ports, as well as into the arrangements on board the cattle boats, and the treatment on the voyage; improvements then required, some of which have since been effected, *Sir C. A. Wood* 7341–7344. 7442–7445.

Evidence showing the great disadvantages of the system of bringing passengers and cattle in the same ships from Ireland; important improvement by the special construction and fitting up of vessels for cattle exclusively, *Sir C. A. Wood* 7347–7554. 7409–7422. 7468, 7469——Reference to a certain statement as showing that the cattle rates from

IRELAND, AND IRISH CATTLE—continued.

2. *Cattle Boats; Extent to which productive of Disease*—continued.

Ireland to England are comparatively high, *Sir C. A. Wood* 7352——Higher price realised by the animals if brought over in better condition in improved boats, *ib.* 7353, 7354.

Particulars relative to the vessels employed by the great Western Company in the Waterford cattle trade; facilities for cleansing them, *Sir C. A. Wood* 7427–7429. 7449–7453——Information relative to the different companies conveying cattle, sheep, and pigs between Ireland and England; doubt as to the proportion carried by railway boats, *ib.* 7481–7485.

Good accommodation in the Irish cattle boats, except that they are often overcrowded, *Luya* 7641–7646. 7670–7672. 7679. 7765–7770.

Satisfaction expressed with the accommodation and arrangements on board the cattle ships from Cork, *Robinson* 8674–8689——Inducement to the shipowners to take every care of the cattle on account of the practice of insuring them against injury or death, *ib.* 8683–8685. 8711–8714——Excellent arrangements on board the Irish cattle ships generally, *ib.* 8686.

Fairly satisfactory arrangements on board the Irish boats which come to Bristol; good condition in which some recent cargoes have arrived, whilst there was only one death on the voyage, *Brown* 9957–9959. 10112. 10132——Expediency of sufficient time for disinfection before a cattle ship from Ireland takes a return cargo of cattle, *ib.* 10222, 10223.

Return submitted by Sir Alexander Wood showing the live stock boat rates between different ports in Ireland and England, *App.* 576. 577.

3. *Scheme of Sir C. A. Wood for amended Transit Arrangements:*

Explanation relative to the improved arrangements proposed by witness by means of cattle depôts at Cork and Waterford, and at Portishead; this scheme has been submitted to the Privy Council, but nothing has been done under it, *Sir C. A. Wood* 7355–7360. 7393–7396.

Scheme submitted by Sir Alexander Wood to the Privy Council in February 1876 in reference to the import of cattle from Ireland, the transit arrangements, inspection, &c., *App.* 569, 570.

4. *Inspection:*

Steps taken by the Irish Government to inspect animals at Irish ports, *Brown* 625——Increased inspection since 1874 of animals imported from Ireland, *ib.* 1061. 1064–1067.

Great want of an efficient government inspection at places in the Severn, other than Bristol, where cattle, sheep, and pigs are landed from Irish boats; particular instances in illustration, *Lord Fitzhardinge* 5260–5276. 5294–5313. 5338, 5339. 5344——Expediency of rigid inspection at the port of landing in England as well as at the port of shipment in Ireland, *Sir C. A. Wood* 7352. 7423–7426.

Careful inspection and expensive disinfection in connection with the Irish cattle trade, but without successful results, *Robinson* 8560——Expediency of the ports or places of landing for Irish cattle being defined, so that inspection may not be evaded, *Brown* 9976–9978.

5. *Proposed Restrictions upon Movement of Cattle in Ireland; similar Regulations desirable for Ireland and England:*

Impossibility of making regulations with regard to Ireland unless the similar regulations are adopted in England, *Simonds* 1154–1157——Desirability of treating Ireland as regards movement of cattle, exactly the same as England, *Booth* 2365, 2366——Recommendation that Irish cattle should be treated in the same way as English cattle and with the same restrictions, *Rea* 3665–3667.

Expediency of treating Ireland in the same way as England instead of as a foreign country, *Wilson* 4782–4784. 4979–4982—— Importance of a strict check upon the movement of cattle in Ireland and upon the holding of fairs wherever disease exists; expediency on the other hand of due facilities for the export of store cattle to England, *ib.* 4942–4945. 5052–5059. 5103–5107——Question as to the proposed restrictions being injurious to the cottiers or small farmers; though the price of their stock will probably be reduced there will be freedom from loss by disease, *ib.* 5124–5128.

It is not proposed to stop import from Ireland, *Stratton* 6843. 6868. 6886, 6887——Opinion that Ireland should be treated as part of England, *Gamgee* 7168——Proposed slaughter of Irish fat cattle under the same restrictions as foreign cattle, *Odams* 8033, 8034. 8120–8123. 8140, 8141.

Discussion of the measures desirable as regards cattle imported from Ireland; regulations suggested by witness to be enforced there as well as in England, *Howard* 8243 *et seq.*

IRELAND, AND IRISH CATTLE—continued.

5. *Proposed Restrictions upon Movement of Cattle, &c.*—continued.

et seq.——Reasons for concluding that small farmers would not be much interfered with by the proposed restrictions, *Howard* 8342–8351.

Expediency of placing Irish cattle under the same regulations as English and Scotch cattle, *Smith* 8512–8514——Ireland should be treated as part of the United Kingdom, and not as a foreign country, *Brown* 10127, 10128, 10140, 10141.

6. *Import into Ireland:*

Proposal as to the prohibition of import of foreign cattle into Ireland, *Brown* 556, 557. 861——Large exportation of short-horns from Yorkshire to Ireland by witness and his family during the last sixty years; considerable increase in the value of Irish cattle from this exportation, *Booth* 2260, 2261. 2343, 2344——Witness would let Ireland still have power to shut her ports against English cattle, *Howard* 8298, 8299——Very rare import of foreign stock into Ireland; the disease in that country being introduced by English stock, *Brown* 10118–10121. 10242–10244.

7. *Store Cattle:*

Large increase contemplated in the import of store cattle from Ireland; that is, under improved regulations, *Sir C. A. Wood* 7382——Introduction of disease from Ireland chiefly by means of stores, which go to all parts of England, *ib.* 7436–7439.

Reasons for altogether stopping the import of store cattle from Ireland, when diseases occur there; the Irish would then take vigorous measures to stamp out disease, *Howard* 8279–8281. 8340, 8341. 8379——Suggestion that store cattle from Ireland be not allowed to go through Glasgow or other large towns, *Melvin* 8913–8919——Modified restrictions desirable as regards the movement of store cattle in Ireland, *Read* 9717–9719.

8. *Pleuro-pneumonia:*

Similar treatment of Irish cattle as of English, in regard to compulsory slaughter for pleuro-pneumonia, *Brown* 1061–1067——Importance of more stringent regulations for suppressing pleuro-pneumonia in Ireland; improvement by compensating the owner for animals killed, *Read* 9593–9597.

9. *Foot-and-Mouth Disease:*

Serious amount of foot-and-mouth disease in the cattle imported to Scotland from Ireland in the last year, *Swan* 1703–1706. 1815–1823——Greater liability of the Irish cattle to foot-and-mouth disease than the English and Scotch cattle, *ib.* 1821——Belief that foot-and-mouth disease is not generated in Ireland, *Booth* 2365, 2366—— Valuable character of certain precautions suggested at the place of export in Ireland, in reference to foot-and-mouth disease, *Wilson* 4962–4969.

Foot-and-mouth disease regularly introduced from Ireland; Irish beasts depreciated in consequence, *Howard* 8249. 8380——Belief that Ireland is now free from foot-and-mouth disease, *Read* 9633, 9634——Comparatively small number of sheep and swine imported from Ireland with foot-and-mouth disease, whilst the Irish cattle are now free from the disease, *Brown* 10133–10136.

10. *Generally as to the Amount of Disease in Ireland:*

Original contamination of Irish cattle by import from England, *Gamgee* 6961—— Much greater liability of England than of Ireland to be affected with international diseases, *ib.* 7075–7079——Healthy character of cattle in Ireland, disease being developed during the transit to England, *Sir C. A. Wood* 7454–7460. 7470.

Import of pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease with Irish cattle, *Luya* 7638. 7647–7649. 7756–7762——Practice of witness in purchasing Irish fat cattle in Leeds, since he has been precluded from obtaining foreign cattle from Hull; good and sound condition of the Irish animals, *Walker* 7793. 7910–7917——Absence of pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease in certain parts of Ireland and Scotland, where there is no import, *Howard* 8303–8305.

Very little disease now in Ireland, *Read* 9633, 9634; *Brown* 10133–10136—— Improved condition in which the Irish cattle now arrive in Norfolk, *Read* 9635–9640.

11. *Great Increase in the Value of Live Stock:*

Fourfold increase in the value of cattle in Ireland, within the last twenty-five years, *Booth* 2344.

12. *Question of a Dead-meat Trade with England:*

Loss in importing dead meat instead of live cattle from Ireland, *Hamilton* 4366–4373 ——Doubt whether dead meat can be sent profitably from the west of Ireland to London, *Gebhardt* 5658——Doubt as to a dead-meat supply being likely to come from Ireland, the quality not being sufficiently good, *Burkett* 6338, 6339. 6348–6352.

IRELAND, AND IRISH CATTLE—continued.

12. *Question of a Dead-meat Trade with England*—continued.

Steps in contemplation some years ago for establishing a dead-meat trade between Ireland and England, *Sir C. A. Wood* 7344——Belief that by the cold-air process dead meat may be safely brought from Ireland to England, *ib.* 7378–7381——Opinion that the American meat trade will probably lead to a dead-meat trade with Ireland, *ib.* 7440.

Large dead-meat trade formerly between Ireland and Liverpool; inferior quality of the meat, so that the trade came to an end, *Luya* 7546–7551——Grounds for the conclusion that a dead-meat trade cannot be successfully established in lieu of the live cattle trade with Ireland, *ib.* 7557–7561——Impracticability of a dead-meat trade with Ireland, *Walker* 7794.

13. *Recommendations by the Committee:*

Recommendation that a searching inquiry be made into the subject of the transit of cattle from Ireland to the ports of Great Britain; into the provisions made for their reception at the ports of departure and of arrival, and into their treatment during the voyage, *Rep.* ix.

Recommendation that the restrictions applicable to Great Britain should be extended to Ireland, or else that ports should be specified to which alone importation of live animals from Ireland should be lawful, the animals not being permitted to be taken inland unless examined and passed by a Privy Council inspector at the port of debarkation, *Rep.* v. viii. ix.

See also *Breconshire. Bristol. Cork. Dublin. Gloucestershire. Liverpool. Norfolk. Waterford.*

Isle of Man. Information respecting a cattle disease in the Isle of Man in 1865, which eventually proved to be a non-contagious affection, *Brown* 228–232.

Islington Market. See *Metropolitan Cattle Market.*

Isolation of Disease. See *Infected Areas. Movement of Cattle.*

K.

Knowles, Henry. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is a cattle and sheep salesman at Hull; has been deputed to represent the trade before the Committee, 9224, 9225——Submits that the prohition of import of live cattle from Germany and Holland into Hull has caused great inconvenience and injury not only to that port but to Sheffield, Leeds, and other large towns previously supplied with live animals from Hull, 9226 *et seq.*

Calculation that there is an extra expense or loss of about 1 *l.* on each bullock sent from Hull to Leeds or Sheffield in the form of dead meat, instead of alive, 9237–9246. 9296–9302. 9343–9347——Serious loss, to the prejudice of the lower classes, through the difficulty in the conveyance of offal to Leeds and other towns, if all foreign cattle coming to Hull must be slaughtered there, 9237. 9242–9246. 9301–9306. 9343–9347. ——Effect of compulsory slaughter in diminishing the import, 9247. 9280.

Difficulty as to the supply of dead meat from abroad to the large fleet of fishing smacks at Hull, 9248–9254——Statement that American meat will not salt, so that the sailors at Hull will not use it, 9250–9252. 9307–9311——Claim on the part of Hull to the same privileges in regard to import from Schleswig-Holstein as are allowed in the case of Deptford Market; examination hereon relative to the markets at Hull and the steps taken, or being taken, to satisfy the requirements of the Privy Council, 9255–9264. 9282. 9293. 9317–9328. 9355–9359.

Excellent condition in which some American cattle have recently arrived at Hull, 9265–9273——Public dislike of American dead meat in Hull, so that there is no demand for it, 9274–9277——Objectionable condition in which the "iced" meat, so called, frequently arrives from America, 9278. 9312–9316——Very few Dutch cows lately imported into Hull, 9783–9785.

Conclusion as to the higher freight when an animal comes as dead meat from Hamburg or Holland than when it comes alive, 9286–9290. 9329–9332——Effect of the restrictions at Hull in raising the price of middle-class meat, on account of German cattle being excluded; difficulty especially as to supplies to shipping, 9333–9342. 9348–9354.

Report, 1877—*continued.*

L.

Lairs. Reference to the lairs at foreign and home ports as fruitful sources of disease, *Wilson* 4829. 4947.

See also *Ireland, &c.*, 1-3. *Waterside Depôts.*

Lambert, Septimus, Junior. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is a salesman largely interested in the cattle trade in Manchester, and appears to give evidence on behalf of the Salford Markets Committee; is also a non-practising member of the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons, 3814-3816. 3891-3893. 4035. 4130-4132.

Information in regard to the American dead-meat trade, into which witness has not embarked; opinion that in the hot weather this trade cannot be successfully carried on, 3817. 3861. 3993-4002. 4012-4034. 4046-4048——Mixed quality of the meat which has come from America into Manchester, 3832-3835.

Decided opinion that it is impracticable to move meat without deterioration after it has been subject to the influence of ice; impossibility of carrying on this trade unless the meat is sold within two days of its arrival, 3853-3855——Obstacles to the dead meat supply becoming a permanent trade and competing with the trade in live animals killed in this country, 3861.

Statement with reference to the import of foreign cattle and sheep by witness; serious effect of the slaughter of animals at the port on the Manchester trade, 3862-3873——Statistics of the number of sheep which have been imported into Manchester from Hamburg during those years when the cattle traffic was not under restrictions; numbers imported in the years when disease was prevalent on the Continent, 3869-3880.

Introduction of the dead-meat trade into Manchester consequent on the falling off in the live import; dependence of Manchester upon free import of foreign sheep, so that prices may be kept at a proper level, 3881-3890——Reasons why the importation of foreign sheep is necessary for the Salford Market; large demand for whole joints of meat by the highly-paid operatives in Lancashire, 3891-3899——Consumption of sheep in Manchester during the first six months of this year, compared with the like period of 1871; falling off of the consumption by the working classes in the present year, 3900-3906. 3986.

Necessity for very stringent regulations for the purpose of stamping out pleuro-pneumonia; belief that such restrictions if they succeeded would be a benefit to the country generally by increasing the amount of the home supply, 3908-3912. 3922-3944. 3950-3953. 4178-4180——Impossibility of stamping out foot-and-mouth disease, 3910. 3978. 4039, 4040——Great importance of removing the jurisdiction of the local authorities in regard to cattle plague, and placing it all in the hands of the central authority; expediency of the inspectors being subject alone to the authority of the Privy Council, so that uniformity of regulations may prevail, 3913-3916.

Recommendations as to the arrangements necessary for governing the foreign importation of cattle; importance of extending international regulations as regards telegraphing the announcement of the outbreak of disease, 3917-3921——Approval of the twelve hours quarantine which is at present in force in the case of foreign cattle, 3917. 3921. 3925——Advocacy of severer penalties in the case of people who do not report cases of pleuro-pneumonia, 3928-3931.

Necessity for more stringent regulations governing the inspection of dairy stock; belief that dairies in towns are the hotbeds of pleuro-pneumonia, 3932-3939——Decided opinion that inoculation should be compulsory when pleuro-pneumonia breaks out in a dairy stock, 3945-3950. 4035.

Complaint, as regards foot-and-mouth disease, that the law in regard to it is harassing and vexatious in every way; argument that the remedy of stamping it out would be worse than the disease, 3954-3984. 4008-4011. 4036-4040. 4063-4069. 4126-4129——Expediency of foot-and-mouth disease being unrestricted, with the exception of travelling on the high road and being shown at store fairs; necessity of a heavy penalty to prevent this, 3972. 3975. 4036. 4063. 4175-4177. 4181, 4182.

Conclusion that even if pleuro-pneumonia were stamped out we could not grow meat enough in this country for the wants of the people; desirability on this account of perfect free trade in cattle, especially in sheep, 3986-3990——Recent arrival of 1,500 American cattle of the best quality within seven days; comparison between the price of these cattle and American dead meat selling at the same time in the Manchester market, 4003-4007. 4070-4075——Loss of weight by live cattle coming from abroad; the loss would be less when transported a shorter distance by rail, 4049-4055. 4077-4081.

Inexpediency of stopping the importation of live cattle into England; belief that such a measure would be a great disadvantage to the country, 4059-4062——The commission upon the sale of carcases is double that for selling live stock, 4082-4085——

Lambert, Septimus, Junior. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

Character of the sheep brought to Manchester for consumption; preference in that market for lean sheep with but little fat, 4082–4095. 4148–4159.

Further statement that the importation of American dead meat will not succeed; more rapid decomposition of this meat than English meat, 4096–4124. 4133–4140. 4163–4170 ——Admirable arrangements adopted in the Manchester public slaughter-houses; reduction of temperature in these establishments to about forty degrees, 4098. 4100. 4106. 4160–4192.

Additional suggestions as to increased stringency in the regulations with the object of eradicating pleuro-pneumonia; approval of the present restrictions if foreign Governments could be relied upon to transmit telegraphic information as to any outbreak, 4141–4147——Considerable increase of price which would result from the stoppage of the import of live cattle into Manchester, 4171——The principal supply of meat to Manchester from June to Christmas is from Ireland, 4174.

Information respecting the price of meat in Manchester during the last six months, 4183–4194——Correction of a statement made by Mr. Hall with reference to the weight of offal in relation to the rest of the carcase; the average weight of the liver and heart is eighteen pounds, 4194–4197.

Lancashire (*Hundred of Salford*). Action taken by the local authority of the county under the Cattle Plague Order of January 1877, *App.* 563.

Landing of Cattle. Great defects in the present system in regard to the want of control over the landing of cattle; absence of means for stopping the movement of vessels or persons on board vessels, *Brown* 41–43.——*See* also *Ireland, &c.*, 1, 3.

Leeds. Complaint as to the prejudicial effect of slaughtering foreign cattle on debarkation at Hull as compared with the former system of bringing the animals to Leeds for slaughter, *Walker* 7789–7792. 7795–7804. 7844. 7903——Relative cost of conveying dead meat and live animals from Hull to Leeds, *ib.* 7801–7804——Very rare instances of pleuro-pneumonia in Leeds, *ib.* 7827–7829——Limited extent to which dead meat comes from London to Leeds; belief that no live animals come from London, *ib.* 7838–7843. 7885–7887.——*See* also *American Dead Meat*, V. *Hull.*

Legislation. Expediency of a short Act of Parliament in lieu of the present Act, giving the Privy Council power to make the necessary regulations in the various districts, *Brown* 943, 944.

Summary of the conclusions and recommendations of the Committee, to which, where required, effect should be given by the Legislature, *Rep.* ix, x.

Lincolnshire. Total inability to trace the cause of the outbreak of cattle plague in Lincolnshire either by the introduction of animals or by people who had been in contact with the Hull infected district, *Brown* 244–254.

Complaint made in the county as to the closing of fairs and markets in consequence of the outbreak near Great Grimsby, *Brown* 10097. 10101, 10102.

Link, John David. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is an American beef agent and provision merchant; has had many years experience in the meat trade in London, 3059–3061. 3139–3141——Consignments of dead meat received by witness from America since October 1875; several cargoes of hogs also received by him from the States, 3062–3065. 3142, 3143——Increase of this trade since its commencement, 3066. 3071. 3078. 3101–3103. 3135, 3136——Mode of transporting the meat from Liverpool to London by train; specially constructed trucks for this purpose, 3067. 3083–3085. 3145.

Information respecting the shipments received from America and the generally good condition of the meat; most of the meat is purchased by butchers for consumption in the West End of London, 3069——High price at which the meat is sometimes sold in London, 3070, 3071. 3090, 3091——General concurrence in the evidence given by Mr. Gillett, 3073–3075. 3138——Strong approval of the process by which the meat is brought over from America in a cold, dry temperature, 3081, 3082.

Statement that the American meat will keep longer than English beef fresh from the slaughter-house; great importance of the meat being chilled right through before being shipped, 3086, 3087. 3092–3095. 3099, 3100. 3128–3131. 3137——Consumption of some of this beef by Her Majesty, by clubs, and other West End customers, who have expressed high approval of its quality; impossibility of distinguishing the meat from Scotch beef, 3088, 3089. 3114. 3133, 3134——The cost of freight, excluding all the machinery and appliances on board ship, is between 3 *l.* and 4 *l.* per carcase, 3098. 3104–3110.

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Link, John David. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

Explanation that some meat condemned in the London market became bad on account of the vessel being longer out than usual, and the ice running short, 3112, 3113——Passenger ships supplied by witness with American meat for consumption on board, 3116-3119. 3132, 3133——Statement as to the quantity brought in weekly to the London market, 3121-3123.

Impossibility for any smell to come from the meat chambers on board the passenger ships, 3124-3127——Adoption of the plan of having separate chambers in the vessel, so that part of the cargo can be dealt with at a time, 3130-3132. 3137.

Linseed. Considerable variation in the price of linseed as food for cattle, *Odams* 8092-8094.

Liverpool. Witness is chief inspector of meat under the Corporation of Liverpool, there being three other inspectors, *Luya* 7488-7493. 7705. 7706——Total of about 1,500 of cattle which come into Liverpool weekly, about 1,000 being consumed in the town, *ib.* 7494-7497——Jurisdiction of the county magistrates over the Stanley Cattle Market, *ib.* 7498-7500.

Import into Liverpool of cattle from Spain, Portugal, Ireland, Scotland, and America, *Luya* 7501-7503——Examination of the cattle on arrival by the Government inspector; subsequent duty of witness, if any animals are diseased, to see to their being slaughtered, *ib.* 7507. 7524-7532. 7639, 7640. 7661-7669. 7747, 7748——Importance of the Stanley Market as a centre of supply to many towns at a distance, *ib.* 7538-7542.

Statement as to the people of Liverpool being very particular about the quality of meat, some being sent to London through not finding a demand in Liverpool, *Luya* 7543-7545. 7682-7685——Regulations as to compulsory slaughter in the case respectively of Irish cattle and Portuguese cattle, *ib.* 7756-7762.

Advantage of separate markets for store cattle and fat cattle in Liverpool, as well as in London, *Read* 9738, 9739.

See also *American Cattle*, 2. *American Dead Meat*, I. V. IX. *Foreign Cattle. Ireland, &c. Sheep.*

Local Authorities:

Suggested improvements in the existing system as regards the duties of the local authorities; these suggestions would doubtless entail a large increase in the present staff, *Brown* 154. 166-168——Opinion that in the event of a fresh outbreak of cattle plague, the Privy Council should be empowered to supersede the local authorities in all cases; though in such event the cost would be greater, it would be fully compensated for, *ib.* 984-988.

Approval of the Privy Council superseding the local authority in the event of any fresh outbreak of cattle plague, *Simonds* 1213-1215; *Rea* 3653-3655. 3796-3798——Great importance of removing the jurisdiction of the local authorities in regard to cattle plague, and placing it all in the hands of the central authority; expediency of the inspectors being subject to the authority of the Privy Council, so that uniformity of regulations may prevail, *Lambert* 3913-3916.

Representation made by the Agricultural Society after the outbreak of cattle plague at Willesden, to the effect that the local authorities should be superseded by the Privy Council, with a view to more effectual steps being taken for preventing the spread of the disease, *Wilson* 4696-4700——Unequal and inconsistent exercise of the powers of the different local authorities under the Act of 1869; illustration in Northumberland, *ib.* 4751-4753. 4755-4759. 4773, 4774——Restrictions in force in thirty-six counties and twenty-nine boroughs in reference to cattle plague, *ib.* 5129.

Entire readiness of the local authorities to submit to a system of Government inspection, *Stratton* 6791-6798——Degree of control suggested in the Privy Council over the local authorities, *Soulby* 7248-7253.

Great want of uniformity in the regulations now applied in this country; expediency of the local authorities being made to conform to the instructions of the Privy Council, *Melvin* 8803-8809—— Importance of a limitation of the number of local authorities, and of uniformity of action throughout the whole of each county, *Read* 9627-9630.

Frequent instances of negligence on the part of local authorities to carry out the necessary regulations; denial that the Privy Council is equally open to this charge, *Brown* 10152-10181. 10220, 10221——Explanation that witness does not propose to supersede the local authorities, or to deprive them of the power of appointing inspectors, *ib.* 10182-10185——Question considered as to the power of the local authorities to stop animals when being moved in contravention of the Animals Order of 1877, *ib.* 10435-10437.

Directions laid down in the Animals Order of 1875, as to the action of local authorities, *App.* 532.

Local Authorities—continued.

List of local authorities in whose districts (either wholly or in part) regulations have been made under the Cattle Plague Order of January 1877, *App.* 538.

List of authorities in whose districts regulations have been made for foot-and-mouth disease, *App.* 558, 559.

Action taken by various local authorities in prohibiting movement, closing markets, &c., *App.* 560, 561.

Conclusion of the Committee as to the unsatisfactory working of the powers committed to the local authority in reference to outbreaks of cattle plague; amendment desirable, *Rep.* iii. ix.

Grounds for the recommendation that uniform rules applicable to all districts declared infected should be enforced by the local authority, subject to the supervision of the Privy Council, *Rep.* iii. v. ix.

See also *Cattle Plague*, 13. *Hull. Inspection. Privy Council. Uniformity of Regulations. Yorkshire.*

London. See *Dairies and Cowsheds. Deptford Market. Metropolis. Metropolitan Cattle Market.*

London, Port of. Number of animals landed respectively at Deptford, Thames Haven, and Brown's Wharf, *Rudkin* 9127-9132.——*See* also *Deptford Market.*

Loss from Disease:

Opinion that the increased cost caused by the proposals of witness would be insignificant as compared with the amount of loss which is sustained by the ravages of contagious disease, *Brown* 527-529. 559-561. 857-860——Enormous losses from cattle plague in 1865-67, *Brown* 857-860. 891-895; *Simonds* 1183-1189——Information respecting the amount of losses from cattle plague in 1872, as compared with the years 1865 to 1867, *Simonds* 1183-1189. 1258-1265. 1292-1296.

Concurrence of evidence as to the great losses, directly and indirectly, caused by foot-and-mouth disease, *Booth* 2341, 2342; *Rea* 2592-3594; *Sheldon* 4532-4537; *Wilson* 4746-4750. 4785-4798. 4878-4890. 4975. 5044-5051; *Stratton* 6774-6783. 6834-6836; *Melvin* 8735-8741; *Tisdall* 9473-9476——Numerous farms unlet throughout the country owing very much to the loss of capital through cattle diseases, *Wilson* 4935, 4936.

Reference to the total amount of loss from cattle diseases, witness submitting however that foot-and-mouth disease is quite as much a native as a foreign complaint, and that animals do not die from it, *Giblett* 6719, 6720. 6727, 6728.

Calculation that from seventy to seventy-five per cent. of the total mortality of cattle in this country is due to international or foreign disease, *Gamgee* 6958-6960——By closing the ports at once more meat would be saved in twelve months than the total value of the animals excluded, *ib.* 6967.

Examination as to the data for witness' conclusion that some seventy per cent. of the cattle mortality in England was due to imported diseases; reference more especially to the very large mortality from pleuro-pneumonia, *Gamgee* 7043-7055. 7061-7074.

Grounds for the conclusion that certain statistics as to the total loss of cattle in this country from disease are quite unreliable; estimate of one-and-a-half per cent. as the total annual deaths from diseases of all kinds, *Brown* 9997-10003. 10098. 10142-10149——More fatal results from pleuro-pneumonia though foot-and-mouth disease is more prevalent, *ib.* 10085, 10086.

Direct loss of about 5,000 *l.* from cattle plague in 1872, and of about 22,000 *l.* in 1877, less the salvage for some of the carcases, *App.* 510.

Great loss not only to the farmer but to the consumer by the ravages of foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia, *Rep.* iv.

See also *Cattle Plague*, 10. *Compensation. Foot-and-Mouth Disease*, 3. *Pleuro-pneumonia*, 3.

Lower Classes. Advantage in importing inferior cattle in order to meet the demand of the lower classes, *Gebhardt* 5513.——*See* also *American Dead Meat. Dead Meat. Foreign Cattle. Meat Supply. Offal. Price of Meat.*

Lung Disease. Distinction between lung disease, as it formerly existed in this country, and pleuro-pneumonia; the former disease was not contagious, *Howard* 8412. 8415.——*See* also *Pluero-pneumonia.*

Luya, Thomas John. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is chief inspector of meat under the Corporation of Liverpool, there being three other inspectors, 7488-7493. 7705, 7706——Total of about 1,500 cattle which come into Liverpool weekly, about 1,000 being consumed in the town, 7494-7497——Jurisdiction of the county magistrates over the Stanley Cattle Market, 7498-7500——Import into Liverpool of cattle from Spain, Portugal, Ireland, Scotland, and America, 7501-7503.

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Luya, Thomas John. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

Very healthy condition in which the Spanish and Portuguese cattle arrive; instances of foot-and-mouth disease, but not of pleuro-pneumonia, 7503-7513. 7636. 7749-7755——Examination of the cattle on arrival by the Government inspector; subsequent duty of witness, if any animals are diseased, to see to their being slaughtered, 7507. 7524-7532. 7639, 7640. 7661-7669. 7747, 7748.

Excellent condition in which the American cattle arrive; greater care taken and better accommodation in the American than in the Irish boats, 7514-7523. 7637. 7678-7681. 7741-7746——Recent origin of the American live cattle trade, 7515, 7516. 7650-7652 High prices realised by the American cattle; comparison with the dead meat prices, 7533-7537. 7653-7658. 7734-7738.

Importance of the Stanley market as a centre of supply to many towns at a distance, 7538-7542——Statement as to the people of Liverpool being very particular about the quality of meat, some being sent to London through not finding a demand in Liverpool, 7543-7545. 7682-7685——Large dead meat trade formerly between Ireland and Liverpool; inferior quality of the meat, so that the trade came to an end, 7546-7551——Greater difficulty in detecting disease in dead meat than in the live animal, 7552-7554.

Grounds for the conclusion that a dead-meat trade cannot be successfully established in lieu of the live cattle trade with Ireland, 7557-7561——Evidence in detail relative to the American dead meat trade with Liverpool, the quality of the meat, the price realised, &c.; adverse conclusions as to the success of this trade, though a large portion of the meat arrives in good condition, 7560-7615. 7659, 7660——Deterioration of meat when much handled; reference hereon to the discoloured and repulsive appearance of some American meat, 7561. 7579-7602. 7659, 7660. 7694-7699. 7710-7712.

Statement as to the American meat trade in Liverpool having greatly fallen off, though the quantity passing through the port into the country has increased, 7570-7579. 7686-7689—— Probability of improved arrangements after a time by which the meat may arrive generally in good order, 7580-7588——Effect of the cold air process, and of subsequent exposure after landing, in prejudicially affecting the taste of the meat, 7589-7594. 7602-7610.

Steps being taken in Liverpool for providing cool stores in which to keep dead meat until it is wanted for use, 7595-7607——Condemnation of some American meat in Liverpool, but not in hot weather especially, 7608-7610——Sale of the meat at prices varying from 4 *d.* to 6¼ *d.* a pound, 7613-7615——Increased price of meat in Liverpool through the cattle plague restrictions; check through the American supply, 7616-7621.

Great importance to Liverpool and the manufacturing districts of the supply of foreign sheep through the London market; advantage if the live animals were sent to Liverpool instead of carcases from Deptford, 7620-7634——Import of pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease with Irish cattle, 7638. 7647-7649. 7756-7762——Good accommodation in the Irish cattle boats, except that they are often overcrowded, 7641-7646. 7670-7672. 7679. 7765-7770.

Fair condition in which some cargoes of South American cattle have arrived at Liverpool; doubt as to this trade increasing, 7673-7677——Loss of some animals during the voyage from America, 7678, 7979. 7739, 7740—— Further examination upon the question whether American meat may not in time be brought over in a generally improved condition, so that the prejudice in Liverpool against the meat may be overcome, 7707-7733.

Belief that with increased experience live cattle may be brought from America in perfect safety throughout the winter, 7746——Regulations as to compulsory slaughter in the case respectively of Irish cattle and Portuguese cattle, 7756-7762——Somewhat similar arrangements in the Irish and American boats for the separation of the cattle, 7765-7770.

Lyon, Alfred. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is the Master of the Butchers' Company in London; has had a large experience in the wholesale meat trade, 3146-3149. 3420-3423——Decided opinion that the introduction of live cattle from abroad is absolutely material to the supply of London; argument that to shut them out would be very bad policy for this country, 3153. 3156. 3303. 3400. 3447.

Statistical information in regard to the importation of American dead meat into London during the present year; within the last week many tons of this meat were condemned as being unfit for food, 3158-3163. 3260-3263. 3382-3394——Explanation that the large quantities in some weeks are to be accounted for by the meat not being good enough for the provinces, and so that it has been sent up to London; very low prices realised for meat which was mouldy and apparently in bad condition, 3160-3163. 3266-3269. 3308-3311. 3388-3390. 3431.

Admission as to the great advantage to this country on account of the introduction of American meat; extensive sale of the meat by the butchers in London, 3164, 3165. 3229. 3306. 3336. 3339-3344. 3353-3355. 3374-3379. 3402-3406. 3433-3439——Grounds for

Lyon, Alfred. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

the opinion that a dead meat trade with the Continent can never be adopted; difficulties as regards the supply of ice, 3166–3175. 3180–3183. 3271, 3272. 3262–3302. 3323. 3325–3335. 3358–3360. 3403–3418. 3443, 3444. 3447, 3448.

Expediency of bringing over all continental meat supplies in the shape of live animals; great importance to this country of the continental supply of live cattle, 3167–3169. 3337, 3338. 3399–3401. 3440. 3447——Low price at which the American meat can be sold in London; fluctuation in price dependent upon the character of the meat, 3172–3175. 3264, 3265——Variable character of the meat when put upon the market; large losses which have occurred through the meat becoming bad on account of delay in transit through bad weather and other causes, 3175–3179. 3245–3248. 3310.

Prejudicial effect of an outbreak of the cattle plague on the meat trade, 3184, 3185. 3445, 3446——Belief that pleuro-pneumonia is not introduced into this country from abroad, but that it is now acclimatised in England; expediency of slaughtering immediately in the case of pleuro-pneumonia, because the animals are never of any use if they live after it, 3186–3204. 3273–3291. 3305. 3320——Decided opinion as to the generally healthy state of the Schleswig-Holstein, the Danish, and the Spanish cattle; occasional instances of pleuro-pneumonia in Dutch cattle which have been fed on hot wash, 3187–3189. 3194–3196. 3287–3289.

Large and increasing importation of cattle from Spain and Portugal, 3190, 3191 —— Disapproval of any measure which will interfere unduly with the food supply of the people, 3199——Opinion that the lung disease has gained such a hold in this country that it would be nearly impossible to stamp it out; animals suffering from this disease very much affected by changes of climate, such as are common in England, 3199–3202.

Desirability of establishing a system of quarantine of from seven to fourteen days in regard to store cattle; suggestion that the quarantine station should be situated a good way down the river, somewhere on the coast of Essex, 3205–3211. 3274. 3363–3365—— Satisfactory regulations which at present exist with reference to the importation of fat animals; belief that the last introduction of cattle plague was mainly due to the neglect of the Corporation of London in not carrying out the orders for immediate slaughter of infected animals, 3212–3220—— Recommendation that animals suffering from cattle plague should be at once slaughtered and buried; expediency of slaughtering all cattle in the same herd (though not infected), and sending the meat to market, 3217, 3218. 3225–3227.

Suggestions as to future precautions to protect the ports from an introduction of cattle plague; necessity for treating as scheduled countries only those in which cattle plague exists, or where there is a probability of its breaking out, 3220–3228——Information respecting the use of offal by the poorer classes in London as an article of food; considerable loss to the poor in respect of the offal, in the event of a dead meat trade, 3230–3234. 3239–3243. 3302. 3312. 3469–3472.

Calculation by the importers of American meat that it cannot be remunerative at a lower price than 6½ *d.*; argument that the meat which has already come to London must have been a great loss, as it has realised nothing like this price, 3235–3238. 3245–3248. 3253–3256. 3369–3373—— Belief that in the week in which so large a quantity of meat was condemned, there could not have been a less loss than 20,000 *l.*; sale of some of this meat on the 1st June at the rate of 1 *s.* 8 *d.* per stone, 3245–3248. 3310, 3311. 3505–3510.

Average price at which beef is imported alive from the Continent, 3249–3252——Good class of bullocks imported from America; opinion that they are nearly equal to English, 3251——Variable character of the live animals that have come from America; occasional deterioration of the meat on account of the fatigue caused by the journey, 3257–3269. 3313–3318——Inferior condition of the American meat caused by overpacking and bringing too much, 3264——Method adopted for trimming and cleansin g themeat, which, though sound and good, is apparently in bad condition, 3266.

Unquestionable superiority of the American stock as compared with the continental; considerable pains which the Americans have taken to improve their breed by crossing them with some of our best animals, 3270. 3321, 3322——Dissent from the veterinary opinion that pleuro-pneumonia remains dormant and cannot be detected for two or three weeks, 3290, 3291——Assertion that continental meat, though fetching in the London market 8 *d.* a pound alive, would not fetch as much as 6½ *d.* a pound as dead meat, 3294–3301.

Absence of danger of an outbreak of cattle plague by the continued import of cattle from the Continent, inasmuch as the animals are only brought from countries where the disease does not and never did exist, 3303——Expediency of prohibiting the importation of cattle from Russia, where cattle plague has always existed, 3303.

Circumstances under which an animal suffering from pleuro-pneumonia may be fit for food, 3320——Price of English meat slightly reduced on account of the introduction of the American, 3345——Satisfactory regulations adopted by the Privy Council for the suppression

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Lyon, Alfred. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

suppression of cattle plague in London; prompt action necessary, 3346-3349——Approval of putting the cowsheds and lairs in London under the control of the local authorities, 3350-3352——Doubt as to the amount of import of live stock in proportion to the total consumption, 3356. 3366-3368.

Reference to the taste of American meat when cooked; opinion that it is not quite so good as English meat when cold, 3380, 3381. 3395-3398. 3543——Instance of a cargo of meat arriving in August, in the very hottest weather, in capital condition; contention, however, that accidents will always render dead meat liable to deterioration in condition and price, 3432-3442. 3449-3454——Statement that the amount of dead meat sent from Scotland to London is nothing to what it was formerly; the consumption of meat in Scotland is much greater than it used to be, 3455-3463. 3566-3572.

Probable sale by the London butchers of American meat as British or Scotch meat; absence of knowledge of any complaint made with reference to this meat by the consumers, 3465-3467. 3544-3547——Description of the parts of a bullock which are known as offal; the value of offal in a carcase worth 20*l.* is about 15*s.* or 16*s.*, 3469-3472——Necessity for killing the continental cattle immediately upon their arrival, and selling the meat quickly, as otherwise it loses its bloom, and is depreciated in value, 3473-3475.

British beef occasionally condemned in the London markets as well as American, 3476, 3477——Decided increase necessary in the importation of dead meat into London before it would make up for the loss of live import, 3481-3483.

Examination in regard to the loss experienced by sending cattle to Deptford Market; grounds for the opinion that a great number of buyers avoid Deptford, 3485-3495. 3498-3501. 3558, 3559. 3564, 3565——Slaughter-houses in London under the control of the Metropolitan Board of Works or the Corporation of London, 3496, 3497.

Less amount of foot-and-mouth disease in foreign than in home cattle; opinion that the health of foreign cattle contrasts favourably with that of our own, 3502. 3554-3557. 3560-3563—— Increase in the price of meat which would necessarily arise from the prohibition of importation of live cattle from abroad, 3503, 3504——Additional information as to the great importance of continuing the importation of live cattle into England, and of not depending wholly upon dead meat; absolute necessity for a butcher to have live animals on his premises, so as to slaughter them as his trade requires, 3511-3536.

Further considerations as to the evil effect upon the foreign supply of live cattle by a continuous supply of dead meat from America, 3537-3542——Considerable difficulties at present in the way of bringing meat from America in a thoroughly good and sound state, 3548-3553.

M.

Manchester and Salford. Statement with reference to the import of foreign cattle and sheep by witness; serious effect of the slaughter of animals at the port on the Manchester trade, *Lambert* 3862-3873——Statistics of the number of sheep which have been imported into Manchester from Hamburg during those years when the cattle traffic was not under restrictions; numbers imported in the years when disease was prevalent on the Continent, *ib.* 3869-3880.

Introduction of the dead-meat trade into Manchester consequent on the falling off in the live import; dependence of Manchester upon free import of foreign sheep, so that prices may be kept at a proper level, *Lambert* 3881-3890——Reasons why the importation of foreign sheep is necessary for the Salford Market; large demand for whole joints of meat by the highly-paid operatives in Lancashire, *ib.* 3891-3899.

Consumption of sheep in Manchester during the first six months of this year, compared with the like period of 1871; falling off of the consumption by the working classes in the present year, *Lambert* 3900-3906. 3986——Character of the sheep brought to Manchester for consumption; preference in that market for lean sheep with but little fat, *ib.* 4082-4095. 4148-4159.

Admirable arrangements adopted in the Manchester slaughter-houses; reduction of temperature in these establishments to about forty degrees, *Lambert* 4098. 4100. 4006. 4160-4162——Considerable increase of price which would result from the stoppage of the import of live cattle into Manchester, *ib.* 4171——The principal supply of meat from June to Christmas is from Ireland, *ib.* 4174——Information respecting the price of meat during the last six months, *ib.* 4183-4194.

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Manure (*Diseased Animals*). Absolute necessity for the destruction of the manure of diseased animals; recommendation that it be rendered harmless by mixing it with its own weight of quick-lime, *Brown* 159-165——Importance further attached to disinfection of the manure of diseased animals, *ib.* 965.

Markets. See *Fairs and Markets.*

May, John William. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is Consul General for the Netherlands, 2010, 2011——Information as to the laws and regulations in Holland with respect to cattle plague; the legislation is founded chiefly on the law of the 20th July 1870, which corresponds with the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act of this country, 2012-2028. 2037-2040. 2074-2079. 2093, 2094. 2109-2112. 2126——Summary of the measures adopted in case of cattle plague, 2016.

Regulations for prohibiting the importation and movement of cattle through the country; dispensatory power given to the Minister of the Interior to modify these regulations when necessary, 2017. 2116-2119——Disinfection of the railway trucks used in the conveyance of cattle entering Holland from foreign countries, 2018——Inspection of cattle before being shipped for foreign countries, 2020. 2054-2058. 2076——Closing of the markets upon the outbreak of cattle plague in Germany in 1873; 2024, 2025.

Entire prohibition of the import of cattle into Holland at the present time; military forces sent to the frontier to enforce this regulation, 2026, 2027. 2144-2152——Explanation of the course adopted in Holland with reference to pleuro-pneumonia; treatment of this disease by means of inoculation, the cost of which is borne by the State, 2028-2036. 2053-2058. 2086-2092. 2099-2105. 2119. 2121-2127.

Considerable diminution in the number of cases of pleuro-pneumonia since the adoption of the slaughter of suspected animals; strong hopes that this disease will be effectually stamped out, 2033-2036. 2048. 2138——Compensation in respect of cattle plague paid out of the Imperial Treasury; compensation in the case of suspected animals given to the full value, and in that of diseased animals half value, 2041-2045. 2080-2085——Returns of the numbers of cattle in Friesland as compared with the rest of the country, 2046-2048.

Opinion entertained in Holland that the lung disease may be propagated by mediate contagion, 2049, 2050——Objection of those interested in the cattle trade in Holland to the limited trade at Deptford as compared with the larger market at Islington, 2051, 2052——Impression that it would be extremely difficult to establish a dead-meat trade with the Netherlands, because of the extra expense to which the senders would be put, 2059-2065——Decided opinion that if the import of live stock from the Netherlands were entirely prohibited, it would tend materially to diminish the raising of stock in that country, 2065-2067. 2113, 2114.

Advantageous arrangements made between the Governments of England and Holland as to telegraphic communication on any outbreak of disease, 2068-2073——Measures applicable to foot-and-mouth disease; statement that this disease is not looked upon with the same alarm as it is in England, 2075-2079. 2095-2098. 2106-2108. 2110, 2111. 2139-2143.

Explanation in regard to the adoption of inoculation as a preventive of pleuro-pneumonia; belief that an animal which has once had this disease will not take it again, 2086-2092. 2099-2105. 2121-2124——Statement as to the markets to which cattle would be sent from the Netherlands if the exportation to England were prohibited, 2128-2130——Occasional importation into Holland of breeding bulls for the purpose of improvement of stocks, 2131.

May, Mr. Sundry decrees and other papers submitted by Mr. May explaining in detail the regulations adopted from time to time in the Netherlands in reference to pleuro-pneumonia, foot-and-mouth disease, &c., *App.* 578-601.

Meat Supply. Statistics of the consumption of cattle during years 1866, 1871, and 1876, in different large towns, *Swan* 1636-1641——Belief that the import of live stock is likely to increase, *ib.* 1809-1811——Increase of consumption of beef in this country as compared with the supply, *ib.* 1850-1852.

Disapproval of any means which will interfere unduly with the food supply of the people, *Lyon* 3199——Effect of stringent regulations which would stamp out the disease in increasing the supply of meat for consumption, inasmuch as farmers would increase their stocks, *Rea* 3602-3606. 3656——Conclusion that even if pleuro-pneumonia were stamped out we could not grow meat enough in this country for the wants of the people; desirability on this account of perfect free trade in cattle, especially in sheep, *Lambert* 3986-3990.

Impression that there is a much larger consumption of beef than mutton in London, *Gebhardt* 5458-5461——Grounds for the conclusion that continued restrictions on free trade in foreign cattle will cause foreigners to reduce their stocks, and not send them to this country, *Pool* 5820-5834. 5840-5844. 6068-6070.

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Meat Supply—continued.

Examination with reference to the probable effect upon the price by diminishing the supply, as by prohibiting the import of live cattle; question, on the other hand, whether this may not be counterbalanced by increased import of dead meat, *Burkett* 6361–6367. 6404–6439. 6445–6479——Effect of the increased price in inducing import of cattle and also of dead meat, *Giblett* 6605–6611——Benefit to the consumer as well as to the farmer br the suppression of disease, *Smith* 8460–8462. 8479.

Consideration by the Committee of the effect of compulsory slaughter at the port of debarkation upon the meat supply of the country; conclusion that the supply to large towns would not be diminished, *Rep.* vii.

See also *American Cattle. American Dead Meat. Australia. Carcases* (*Diseased Animals*). *Cattle Plague. Dead Meat. Deptford Market. Foot-and-mouth Disease. Foreign Cattle. Free Trade. Germany. Holland*, 3. *Home Supply. Loss from Disease. Offal. Price of Meat. Sheep.*

Mediate Contagion. Explanation of the term "mediate contagion"; great difficulty experienced by the authorities in preventing the extension of disease by this means in cases of cattle plague, *Brown* 14, 15. 41–48——Belief that there is no danger of mediate contagion as regards pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease; illustration in support of this theory, *ib.* 43–48. 913–921. 803–808. 10083, 10084.

Decided opinion that the slaughter at the place of landing has not been a sufficient protection against cattle plague, in consequence of the facility at the same time for mediate contagion, *Brown* 301, 302——Expediency of the authorities being empowered to make regulations for preventing the conveyance of disease by mediate contagion in the event of slaughter at the port of debarkation, *ib.*775, 776.

Opinion entertained in Holland that the lung disease may be propagated by mediate contagion, *May* 2049, 2050.

Melvin, James. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is President of the Scotch Chamber of Agriculture; is largely interested as a cattle breeder and grazier, 8717–8722——Has had considerable experience of live stock in his capacity as director of the New Zealand and Australian Land Company, 8723–8726.

Outbreak of cattle plague on a former farm of witness in 1865-66; exemption since that time, 8727–8729——Frequent losses of witness from pleuro-pneumonia previously to the cattle plague regulations; probable causes of the stoppage of the disease, 8730–8734——Serious loss of witness from foot-and-mouth disease in 1871 and 1873; average depreciation of 2 *l.* per head of cattle attacked, 8735–8741.

Views of the Scotch Chamber of Agriculture as to the expediency of the slaughter of all foreign cattle at the port of debarkation; memorials to the Privy Council to this effect, 8742–8748——Memorial also from the District Association of Mid-Calder praying for certain restrictions on the import of foreign cattle, 8749, 8750——Feeling of Scotch farmers generally that foreign cattle should be slaughtered at the port of landing, 8751.

Great diminution in the import of store stock into Scotland, it being now practically confined to milch cows from Denmark and Holland, 8752, 8753. 8858——Feeling of the Scotch farmers adverse to the continued import of foreign cows; danger thereby of the spread of pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease from the dairies in Edinburgh, Leith, and other towns, 8754–8776. 8846. 8859–8862. 8879–8881. 8908–8911.

Belief that if all foreign cattle were slaughtered at the port of debarkation there would be a great increase of home breeding in Scotland for dairy and other purposes, and that better cattle would be bred but for the risk of the disease, 8758, 8759. 8855, 8856. 8863, 8864, 8882–8905. 8923–8927——Much less amount of pleuro-pneumonia in the dairies in Glasgow than in Edinburgh and Leith, the former being supplied chiefly from home districts whilst in the latter there are many Dutch cows, 8762–8774. 8845.

Conclusion as to pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease coming entirely from abroad, 8777——Very little pleuro-pneumonia in Scotland save in the towns, 8778, 8779——Belief that by stringent regulations and by restrictions upon import, cattle diseases in Scotland may be exterminated; experience of Australia adverted to hereon, 8780. 8783–8795. 8812–8829——Grounds for the opinion that contagious diseases are not engendered on board ship, 8781, 8782.

Successful conduct of a dead meat trade by sea between Sydney and Melbourne several years ago, 8796–8802——Great want of uniformity in the regulations now applied in this country; expediency of the local authorities being made to conform to the instructions of the Privy Council, 8803–8809——Suggested appointment of travelling inspectors for the supervision of the local arrangements, 8809–8811——Contemplated appointment of the local inspectors by the local authorities, 8811.

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Melvin, James. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

Opinion that in cases of pleuro-pneumonia movement should be prohibited for three months out of the infected locality, 8812-8817——Suggested prohibition of movement for one month out of any area in which foot-and-mouth disease has occurred, 8818, 8819——Expediency of a considerable increase of penalties, 8820——Further statement as to the willingness of the farmers in Scotland to conform to very stringent regulations at home in conjunction with a system of slaughtering of foreign cattle at the port of debarkation, 8821-8829.

Very large number of live stock in Australasia, there being 70,000,000 sheep and 7,000,000 cattle, 8830, 8831——Attempts made and being made to import dead meat from Australia; good prospect of success, 8832-8836——Prohibition in Australia upon the import of live cattle from England through fear of disease; importance on this score of freedom from disease at home, as causing improved breeds to be sent to Australia, whence improved and enlarged supplies may be returned to this country, 8837-8843. 8865-8867——Very stringent regulations in New Zealand as to the admission of live stock from England, 8841-8843.

Hardship in abolishing town dairies; expediency rather of placing them under stringent regulations, 8847-8849. 8876-8878. 8906, 8907——Inconvenience if all cattle dealers and drovers in Scotland were obliged to be licensed, 8850-8852——Inferior character as a rule of the lean stock imported into Scotland, 8853, 8854——Impracticability of an effective system of quarantine, 8857.

Further expression of the opinion that neither from America, Spain, Denmark, nor any other country should cattle be admitted for circulation in England, but should be slaughtered at the port of landing, 8868-8875——Inferiority of the Danish cows to the Dutch cows; relative prices of these and of English and Scotch cows, 8879. 8908. 8920-8922.

Diminished extent to which cows are now kept by farm labourers in Scotland; prejudicial effect of this change, 8896-8903——Advocacy of free trade, but not of free trade in cattle disease, 8904, 8905——Belief as to the impracticability of guarding against the import of disease with Dutch cows, 8909, 8910.

Advantage of separate markets for fat stock and lean stock; reference more especially to lean stock from Ireland, 8911-8916——Expediency of uniform regulations for England, Scotland, and Ireland, 8913——Suggestion that cattle from Ireland be not allowed to go through Glasgow or other large towns, 8913. 8919——Healthy character of Highland cattle, 8917, 8918.

METROPOLIS:

Injurious effect of a cordon round London beyond which cattle could not be sent out of London; enhanced price of meat outside the cordon, *Gebhardt* 5500-5507——Exception taken to the view that there are worse hot beds of disease in London than in the country, *Pool* 5896-5899——Very inadequate protection by means of the cordon round London, it being frequently violated, *Odams* 7939, 7940.

Opinion that in the metropolis the Privy Council should supersede all local authorities and should exercise sole jurisdiction, *Rudkin* 9003-9005. 9188——Authority exercised respectively by the Metropolitan Board of Works and the Corporation of London, in respect of cattle, witness further submitting that they should both be superseded by the Privy Council, *ib*, 9123-9126. 9188-9190——Expediency of the cordon round London being regulated by the Privy Council, *ib.* 9188.

Importance attached to the cordon round London; question as to the relaxations desirable, *Brown* 10064-10066. 10107-10110——Contemplated maintenance of the cordon round London till the end of 1877; approval of the cordon being permanently continued if cattle from Germany be allowed to come in, *ib.* 10441-10444——Practical difficulty in keeping up the cordon; modification suggested, *ib.* 10445, 10446.

Recent prohibition of movement from the north of the metropolis to any places south of the Thames, *Brown* 10325, 10326——Frequent evasion under the regulations as to movement of cows in the metropolis under license, *ib.* 10391. 10397. 10453.

Orders of Council in January 1877, applying certain restrictions upon movement within the metropolis, *App.* 544.

Orders of Council of 18th and 19th July 1877, imposing restrictions upon movement in the metropolis, in view of the further outbreak of cattle plague, *App.* 604, 605.

See also *American Dead Meat. Cattle Plague. Cows. Dairies and Cowsheds. Dead Meat. Deptford Market. Metropolitan Cattle Market.*

METROPOLITAN CATTLE MARKET:

Considerable falling off in the supply of foreign meat to the Metropolitan Market, *Brown* 779-784—— Statistics of the relative number of English and foreign cattle sold in the market, *Gebhardt* 5215, 5216. 5224. 5404-5413.

METROPOLITAN CATTLE MARKET—continued.

Frequency of foot-and-mouth disease spreading through means of the lairs in the Islington Market, *Gebhardt* 5444——Suggestion that the market be limited to fat cattle, and that no animals be moved thence into the country save under a killing license, *ib.* 5444-5450. 5521, 5522. 5659——Very rare purchases of store cattle in the market, *ib.* 5447. 5521. 5659.

Estimate that about half the supply of foreign beasts and sheep sold at Islington go into the country, *Gebhardt* 5496. 5499——Practice of selling on Monday the beasts which arrive on Saturday, or in good time on Monday, *ib.* 5498.

Explanation in further reference to the proposal that Islington Market be used only for fat animals, and that all animals moved thence into the country should go under a killing license, *Gebhardt* 5602-5608——Concurrence in Mr. Gebhardt's suggestion that all animals moved from Islington Market into the country be marked for slaughter, *Pool* 5896-5905; *Giblett* 6581-6584. 6589, 6590.

Total number of foreign cattle and foreign sheep in the Islington Market in the first six months of 1876 and of 1877, *Rudkin* 8936, 8937——Decided conviction of witness that the market is largely supplied with diseased animals, and that it is essential to confine the market to fat stock, which should not be allowed to leave the metropolis alive, *ib.* 8983-8992. 9140-9142. 9191-9193. 9198-9201.

Objection to animals sold in the London market being allowed to go alive into the country if marked for slaughter, *Rudkin* 8991, 8992——Opinion that one market, where all animals should be slaughtered, would suffice for London, *ib.* 8993, 8994.

Grounds for the opinion that if there were a cordon round the metropolis (as recommended by witness in 1865), foreign cattle might be allowed to come to Copenhagen Market without insisting upon slaughter at Deptford; preference for the latter alternation, *Rudkin* 9092-9099. 9139-9148——Due attention paid to the cleansing of Copenhagen Market, *ib.* 9191, 9192——Absence of hardship to English farmers by requiring all animals sent to the Metropolitan Market to be slaughtered within the metropolis, *ib.* 9220-9223.

Importance of a provision that no animal shall be moved from Islington Market into the country unless it is marked for slaughter, *Read* 9533-9543. 9738, 9739——Recent instance of a very badly diseased animal in the market, *ib.* 9548, 9549.

Difficulty in insuring the subsequent slaughter of animals sold at Islington, although they might be branded for slaughter, *Brown* 10007-10009.

Grounds for the recommendation that stock exposed in Islington Market should not be allowed to leave the metropolitan district alive, *Rep.* viii, ix.

See also *Deptford Market.*

Middlemen and Jobbers. Belief as to the frequent conveyance of disease through the purchases made by middlemen and jobbers, *Gebhardt* 5659.

Milk. Absence of any scarcity of milk, notwithstanding the prevalence of fatal diseases among dairy cows, *Brown* 906-912——Evidence in favour of London and other large towns being supplied with milk from the country exclusively, *Swan* 1693-1696. 1723-1725; *Wilson* 4840-4852. 4893-4898. 5019-5023. 5067, 5068; *Gebhardt* 5441-5443. 5627-5629; *Gamgee* 7012-7014; *Rudkin* 8995, 8996.

Prospect of milk being produced more largely than cheese when refrigeration is more valued, *Wilson* 4847. 5122, 5123——Advantage, on sanitary grounds, in London and other large towns being supplied entirely with country milk, *ib.* 4893-4898——Belief that the quality of milk is not injured by refrigeration, *ib.* 4938-4940.

Conclusion as to the better quality of country milk than of London milk, *Gebhardt* 5630-5632——Reduced supply and increased price of milk in towns (as in Dublin) since the introduction of disease, *Gamgee* 7014-7016.

Considerable increase in the price of milk owing to the increased cost of cows and the risk from disease, *Tisdall* 9413-9415——Facility of dispensing with the import of foreign cows into London without increasing the price of milk, *ib.* 9483-9485.

Great improvement by supplying London and other large towns with milk from the country exclusively, as upon the plan adopted by the Aylesbury Dairy Company, *Read* 9698-9702.

See also *Cows.* *Dairies and Cowsheds.* *Refrigeration.*

Mortality from Disease. See *Cattle Plague.* *Foot-and-Mouth Disease.* *Loss from Disease.* *Pleuro-pneumonia.*

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Movement of Cattle:

The movement of animals from any centre where foot-and-mouth disease or pleuro-pneumonia is discovered should be strictly prohibited, *Brown* 310——Necessity, in the case of pleuro-pneumonia and foot and-mouth disease, of accompanying the prohibition of importation of foreign stock with stringent regulations at home; as long as free movement in this country continues it will be impossible to get rid of these diseases, *ib.* 513-516. 545-548. 558——Necessity for severe measures if it be determined to eradicate the diseases in question, *ib.* 820-826.

Belief that it would be impossible to stamp out contagious diseases in England, as the English people would not tolerate the measures necessary for that purpose, *Müller* 1593-1597.

Desirability for perfect free trade as regards cattle between one part of England and another, 2265. 2364——Disapproval of permitting in all cases the movement of animals from an infected district with a pass from a qualified inspector; discretion necessary in the local authority, *ib.* 2299-2302.

Concurrence in Professor Brown's suggestion for dividing the country into districts, and for preventing movement out of any centre in which pleuro-pneumonia or foot-and-mouth disease exists, *Wilson* 4764-4781——Contemplated removal of cattle from Ireland to England, and from one place to another in England, subject to a license or certificate as to local exemption from disease, *Stratton* 6868-6875. 6886, 6887.

Disapproval of severe restrictions upon inland movement of cattle as not necessary in regard to foot-and-mouth disease if foreign cattle be excluded, *Gamgee* 6993-6996——Expediency of a minimum of interference with the home trade generally, *ib.* 6994. 7024.

Conclusion that the restrictions and regulations hitherto have been unsuccessful only because they have not been properly applied, and that additional precautions are essential, not only as regards foreign import but home movement, &c., *Read* 9621-9626——Suggestions as to the restrictions upon inland transit and upon fairs and markets which should be adopted concurrently with the slaughter of all foreign cattle at the port of debarkation, so as to exterminate foot-and-mouth disease, *ib.* 9671-9679——Contemplated localisation of the restrictions upon movement in the case of foot-and-mouth disease, *ib.* 9754.

Explanation that witness does not propose slaughtering at the port of debarkation, in reference to foot-and-mouth disease, unless stringent measures be also enforced as regards movement of cattle at home and the holding of fairs and markets, *Brown* 10056-10058. 10080. 10101, 10102. 10248, 10249——Restrictions further proposed as regards movement when disense is detected in any district, *ib.* 10056, 10057. 10101, 10102——Proposed limitation of home restrictions to those localities in which disease exists; if disease were general the restrictions should be applied to the whole country at the same time, *ib.* 10270-10274.

Form of movement license prescribed by the Animals Order of 1875 in reference to foot-and-mouth disease, *App.* 533.

Orders of Council in January 1877, and subsequently, placing various restrictions upon the movement of cattle, and upon the holding of fairs and markets, *App.* 544 *et seq.*

Action taken by various local authorities in prohibiting movement into their districts, *App.* 560.

Conclusion of the Committee as to the absolute necessity of stringent regulations at home, if restrictions be placed on the foreign trade; recommendations as to the restrictions upon movement, *Rep.* iv. ix, x.

See also *Cattle Plague*, 5. *Fairs and Markets.* *Farmers.* *Foot-and-Mouth Disease*, 5. *Infected Areas.* *Ireland, &c.*, 5. *Metropolis.* *Metropolitan Cattle Market.* *Norfolk.* *Pleuro-pneumonia*, 4. *Yorkshire.*

Müller, Professor Charles. (Analysis of his Evidence).—Is Professor of Anatomy in the Berlin Veterinary College, and is one of the six ordinary members of the Prussian Veterinary Department; does not appear before the Committee in an official capacity, 1337-1340——Information as to the composition of the veterinary staff in Germany; the most trustworthy of this staff are employed upon the eastern frontier from Memel on the Baltic to Upper Silesia, in consequence of that frontier being the most liable to the outbreak of cattle plague, 1341-1348.

Regulations now in force in Prussia with reference to the prevention of the introduction of cattle plague; prohibition by the German authorities of any treatment for cattle plague on account of the belief that no measure answers except stamping out, 1349-1370. 1477, 1478. 1492-1498. 1509, 1510. 1536-1538. 1620-1624——Statement that the outbreak in Germany in the year 1872 was caused by smuggling diseased animals over the frontier to Breslau; considerable risk of this smuggling in Upper Silesia, 1350-1354. 1371-1377. 1605-1611. 1623-1628.

Total prohibition of importation of cattle from Russia into Germany; prohibition also of grey or steppe cattle from Austria, 1351-1354——Increased vigilance on the part of the

Müller, Professor Charles. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

the German authorities after the outbreak of 1872; appointment thereupon of veterinary inspectors and armed policemen, 1358——Establishment in Germany of a census of cattle throughout the districts; the restriction as to movement of cattle, with reference to this census, is confined only to cases of cattle plague, 1358-1360. 1581-1587——Special permit required for the transmission of cattle by railway from certain border stations to the interior, 1365-1368.

Export of cattle from all markets in Germany stopped when the central authority has been informed of a case of cattle plague in the border districts; opinion as to the efficacy of this arrangement, 1368, 1369——Absence of restrictions upon the movement of store cattle throughout Germany, 1370——Means adopted for the suppression of cattle plague when discovered; slaughter of all diseased animals and of those which have come in contact with them, 1378-1389. 1392, 1393.

Compensation paid by the German Government to the full value of all the cattle slaughtered on account of cattle plague; less amount paid as compensation in the case of animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia, 1379-1385. 1390, 1391. 1433-1438. 1511-1516——Cost of carrying out the regulations in regard to the suppression of cattle plague borne wholly by the Imperial Government, 1379. 1395——Diseased animals when slaughtered, buried to the depth of two metres, 1386. 1388, 1389——Military cordon drawn round the Polish or Austrian frontiers when cattle plague exists in these districts, 1392, 1393.

Great difficulty experienced in discovering the first cases of disease in the markets; opinion that it is more easily discovered in the living animal than in the dead carcase, 1396-1399. 1612-1616——Intention of the German authorities to construct slaughtering establishments on the frontier, and there to permit the slaughter of Austrian cattle under veterinary inspection, 1401, 1402——Explanation of the delay in transmitting from Germany to England information in regard to the late outbreak of cattle plague; in future the Prussian Government will telegraph to England by means of every local authority, and not by the central authority only, 1403-1409. 1421.

Estimate of the expenses borne by the German Government on account of the last outbreak of cattle plague; inclusion in this estimate of all cost of destruction of buildings and cost of burying, 1410-1418——Possibility of cattle plague being conveyed by means of sheep; infrequency of sheep being attacked with the disease, 1419, 1420. 1520-1523. 1549, 1550——Grounds for the belief that the exportation of live cattle from Germany to this country may be continued without great peril for slaughtering purposes, 1421-1425. 1543-1548. 1617, 1618——Absence of danger in regard to exportation of cattle from Schleswig-Holstein on account of the immunity from cattle plague in that country; strictness of the regulations in Schleswig in regard to drawing a cordon round the infected places, 1421-1425. 1464, 1465. 1503-1508. 1544, 1545.

Information respecting the diseased cattle which were brought to England in the "Castor;" superficial examination made by the veterinary inspector in Germany, for which he has since been severely punished, 1421, 1422. 1469-1476. 1525-1534. 1556-1562——Pleuro-pneumonia dealt with in Prussia in the same way as cattle plague; prohibition of importation of cattle from the Netherlands, where this disease is rife, 1426-1432. 1439-1444. 1499-1501——Unfavourable opinion of witness as to inoculation as a preventative of pleuro-pneumonia, notwithstanding that many men of high standing approve of the system, 1441, 1442.

Absence of stringent regulations for stamping out foot-and-mouth disease in Germany, inasmuch as the means for stamping it out would entail a greater loss than the disease itself; regulations now in force as to this disease, 1445-1450. 1502. 1517-1519——Compensation in the case of horses slaughtered for glanders, paid by the local authority to the amount of half the value, 1451-1454——Dissent from some of the statements made by Professor Brown, in connection with cattle plague and its introduction into England from Germany, 1454-1463——Severity of the last outbreak of cattle plague in Germany, 1466-1468——Existence at the present time of cattle plague in Poland; certainty of its existing in Roumania, because it follows the Russian army, 1479-1491.

Largest exports to England from Schleswig-Holstein, Oldenburg and Madgeburg, in Saxony, 1489——Admission permitted to the Berlin market of all cattle, though none are allowed to be moved away alive, 1497, 1498. 1564——Rinderpest unknown in Prussia except when introduced by foreign cattle, 1524——Prohibition of importation of cattle to England from Germany at the present time; destination of the German cattle which would otherwise be sent to England, 1539-1542——Considerable export of sheep from Germany to France, 1542.

Expediency of placing Germany in the same state as regards export of cattle to England, as she was before the outbreak of cattle plague, 1543-1548——Infrequency of cattle plague being carried by mediate contagion; possibility of carrying it by means of manure adhering to the feet, 1551-1555. 1566-1578——Expediency of slaughtering German cattle at Deptford upon their arrival, 1551-1555. 1570-1578.

Müller, Professor Charles. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

Belief that if Germany were unscheduled the import of sheep to England would be very much increased, 1563——Explanation of the danger which exists in Germany in regard to the great markets for slaughtering, 1565——Belief that arrangements for bringing dead meat to England from a great distance would fail on account of the difficulty of selling the offal to advantage, 1579, 1580——Statement that the veterinary department at Hamburg is not under the control of the veterinary department at Berlin; regulations in Hamburg precisely the same as those in Prussia, 1588–1590.

Opinion that contagious diseases of cattle are never originated spontaneously in western Europe, but that they are spread by contagion, 1591——Belief that it would be impossible to stamp out contagious diseases in England, as the English people would not tolerate the measures necessary for that purpose, 1593–1597——Statement that dairies near the large towns in Germany are hotbeds of pleuro-pneumonia, 1599–1601.

Further information as to the inspectors acting under regulations from the central department in Germany; in cases of pleuro-pneumonia they act under the authority of their own State and not under the laws of the Empire, 1602–1604——Frequent instances in Germany of the cattle-plague being communicated by means of dead meat, 1613–1616.

N.

Netherlands. See *Holland.*

New Zealand. Very stringent regulations in New Zealand as to the admission of live stock from England, *Melvin* 8841–8843.

Newcastle. Excessive disease engendered in the dairy-sheds or byres in Newcastle, *Wilson* 4834. 4851. 4983.

Belief as to the facility for slaughtering at the Port of Newcastle, and for carrying on a dead meat trade with the adjacent districts, *Brown* 10206–10217.

Memorial from the Borough of Newcastle, submitting the facilities provided in the borough for the foreign cattle trade, and urging that no undue restrictions should be imposed upon the import of foreign cattle, *App.* 602, 603.

Norfolk. Introduction of foot-and-mouth disease from the Islington Market into Norfolk on several occasions, *Read* 9540–9543. 9735–9737——Successful results of the system of isolation and slaughter in Norfolk in reference to pleuro-pneumonia; steady diminution in the disease in the country, *ib.* 9580–9582. 9639——Reduced amount of salvage paid in Norfolk on account of the value for food of the animals killed; wholesome character of the meat, *ib.* 9582–9587.

Statement as to Norfolk being now free from foot-and-mouth disease, *Read* 9598–9600——Very large number of Irish store cattle brought into Norfolk, *ib.* 9615——Increase of foot-and-mouth disease in Norfolk at the time when there is most transit of Irish cattle, *ib.* 9705, 9706.

Norway. See *Sweden and Norway.*

Notice (*Prohibition of Import, &c.*) Fairness in at least giving due notice to the foreigner before prohibiting import, *Gebhardt* 5677. 5769, 5770——Suggestions as to the notice to be given before applying a system of compulsory slaughter at the ports, *Rudkin* 9205, 9206; *Brown* 10020, 10021. 10040, 10041; *Rep.* vii.

O.

Odams, James. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Has been deputed to represent the Central Chamber of Agriculture; gave evidence before the Select Committee of 1873; 7932, 7933—— Recommended in 1873, and still considers, that all foreign fat cattle coming in the holds of vessels should be slaughtered at the port of debarkation; that is, on the score chiefly of the proved failure of inspection, 7934–7946. 8006–8017. 8026, 8027, 8040–8043. 8052–8055. 8071–8074. 8137.

Belief as to the constant development of disease in the holds of vessels, 7937. 7946. 8030——Reference to the case of the "Castor" as illustrating the inefficacy of inspection, 7938. 8071–8074——Very little faith of witness in the restrictions imposed in Germany, 7939. 7941——Very inadequate protection by means of the cordon round London, it being frequently violated, 7939, 7940——Statement as to foot-and-mouth disease having been detected in some Danish cattle landed at Newcastle after they had passed the first inspection, 7941–7943. 8078–8082.

Considerable decrease in the amount of stock in this country, owing very much to the apprehension of disease, 7947–7956——Entire willingness of farmers to submit to almost any restrictions in order that losses from disease may be prevented; good grounds of witness for this statement, 7957–7964. 8058–8066.

Odams, James. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

Doubt as to there being much difference between the prices at Deptford Market and at the Metropolitan Market; disadvantage of the former in not having direct railway communication, 7965–7970. 7973, 7974. 8033. 8095–8102——Regularity of supply and increase of competition at Deptford if there were improved accommodation and if all foreign cattle were slaughtered on landing, 7967–7970. 8016——Increased dead meat trade from Deptford to the provinces if there were direct railway communication, 7971–7974. 8000. 8102.

Advantage of a dead-meat over a live-cattle trade on the score of cost of transit, 7975, 7976——Belief that commercial enterprise and science will soon develop a dead-meat trade throughout the country, 7977, 7978. 7982, 7983. 8056, 8057——Conclusion as to the deterioration of live cattle on board steamers, 7979–7981——Reference to the use made of offal in America, 7984, 7985——Statement showing that offal may be conveyed a considerable distance in perfectly good condition, 7986–7992. 7995.

Facility of establishing cool stores or chambers in connection with a largely extended dead-meat trade, 7993–8000——Successful experiments in the conveyance of refrigerated dead meat from South America and from Australia on board the "Frigorific" and "Northam," 8000–8004——Stringent regulations desirable as regards the London cowsheds, 8005–8008——Increase of breeding at home but for the fear of imported disease, 8009, 8010.

Grounds for the opinion that live cattle from America and Canada should be slaughtered at the port of landing, 8013–8015. 8040——Urgent want of improved arrangements in the transit of Irish cattle; development of disease by the neglect and cruelty under the present system, 8018–8025. 8028. 8030. 8114, 8115——Great cruelty more especially in conveyance by railway; outrage upon humanity now involved, 8020–8022——Prevalence of pleuro-pneumonia in Holland, 8029——Expediency of foreign store cattle being transported on deck, 8030, 8031. 8138, 8139.

Proposed slaughter of Irish fat cattle under the same restrictions as foreign cattle, 8033, 8034. 8120–8123. 8140, 8141——Conclusions as to the diminished stock of sheep being partly attributable to fear of disease, 8035–8039——Belief that three-fourths of the disease in this country might be prevented by proper treatment, 8044, 8045.

Probable increase in the price of meat in other countries as well as under the legislation in force in England, 8046–8051——Careful restrictions under which dairy cows might be imported, 8054——Doubt as to the expediency of admitting grazing cattle, 8055——Way in which cattle plague was probably introduced by means of the "Castor," 8074——Improved arrangements as regards disinfection of cattle ships, 8075——Improved practice also in stamping out cattle plague, 8076, 8077.

Progressive increase expected in the stock of cattle in England, but for the risk of disease, 8083–8091——Considerable variation in the price of linseed, as food for cattle, 8092–8094——Further evidence as to the want of improved arrangements in connection with Deptford Market, 8095–8102——Comment upon the heavy rent charged by the Corporation for the Market, and upon the charge of 5 *d.* for each bullock landed, 8103–8108.

Relative charges of salesmen for the sale of foreign and of English bullocks, 8109, 8110——Opinion as to pleuro-pneumonia in this country not being necessarily introduced by foreign cattle, 8111–8113——Comparative condition in which cattle arrive from Ireland and from the Continent, 8116–8119.

Approval of the continued sale of Scotch cattle in the Metropolitan Market, 8123——Instance of a badly diseased cargo of cattle from Oporto, 8125–8129——Improved regulations for the cleansing of railway trucks; great neglect, however, in other respects, 8130–8135——Statement as to water not being provided at many stations, 8134, 8135. 8142–8144.

OFFAL:

1. *Objections to a Dead Meat Trade on account of the Difficulty and Loss on the Score of Offal.*
2. *Evidence at variance with the foregoing Conclusions.*
3. *Other Details generally.*

1. *Objections to a Dead Meat Trade on account of the Difficulty and Loss on the Score of Offal:*

Belief that arrangements for bringing dead meat to England from a great distance would fail on account of the difficulty of selling the offal to advantage, as well as on other grounds, *Müller* 1579, 1580; *Pool* 5980–6000——Decided opinion that to send offal from Germany to England fit for food would be impracticable, *Baron von Behr* 2475–2477.

Evidence respecting the advantage of live animals in providing offal for the use of the poor; belief that offal can never be brought to this country from abroad and sold for consumption, *Hall* 2885–2888. 2891–2895. 2973–2977. 2988——Information respecting the use of offal by the poorer classes in London as an article of food; considerable loss to the poor in respect of the offal if a dead-meat trade were established, *Lyon* 3230–3234. 3239–3243. 3302. 3312. 3469–3472.

Offal—continued.

Grounds for the conclusion that it is impracticable to establish a trade in the import of offal as well as of dead meat, *Gebhardt* 5241–5247——Statement to the effect that offal cannot be sent from London into the country in hot weather, *ib.* 5517. 5518——Difficulty through the inability to dispose of the offal at the port of export, such as Tonning, *ib.* 5618, 5619. 5721–5725.

Consideration of the difficulties in the disposal of offal in connection with import from the Continent, *Pool* 5988-6000 —— Difficulty in the disposal of offal at Deptford, *Giblett* 6636, 6637——Great importance of supplies of offal for the poorer classes, whereas offal cannot be imported in good condition, *ib.* 6748–6751.

Difficulty as regards offal for the lower classes in Leeds if live animals were not killed on the spot, *Walker* 7795-7800——Serious loss to the prejudice of the lower classes through the difficulty in the conveyance of offal from Hull to Leeds and other towns if all foreign cattle coming to Hull must be slaughtered there, *Knowles* 9237. 9242–9246. 9301–9306. 9343–9347.

2. *Evidence at variance with the foregoing Conclusions:*

Examination to the effect that the poor would not suffer from any loss of offal through the cattle being slaughtered at the port of debarkation or at the port of shipment; belief as to the practicability of conveying the offal without its being spoiled, *Brown* 1032–1036. 1094–1100. 1103, 1104——Opinion that the offal could be sent from abroad as well as the meat, *Sheldon* 4633, 4634 —— Good condition in which offal may be brought from the Continent as well as from America, *Burkett* 6393–6397.

Perfectly sound state in which the offal may be imported. *Gamgee* 7118 ——Statement showing that offal may be conveyed a considerable distance in perfectly good condition, *Adams* 7986–7992. 7995.

Considerable quantities of offal formerly imported in good condition, *Robinson* 8628–8631. 8642—— Statement showing that offal can be, and is, conveyed from Deptford for considerable distances without difficulty, *ib.* 8632–8642.

Room for much improvement in the treatment of the offals whereby they may safely be sent long distances; excellent arrangements in Paris in this respect, *Rudkin* 8976–8980. 9134. 9149, 9150. 9187——Way in which the offal is now disposed of from Deptford without difficulty, *ib.* 9154–9156.

Transmission of offal from Norfolk to London without loss, *Read* 9561. 9563. 9565 ——Further grounds for the conclusion that offal may be imported from the Continent in good condition, *Brown* 1029–1033.

Conclusion of the Committee that offal, as well as dead meat, may be supplied in good condition to country towns, *Rep.* vii.

3. *Other Details generally:*

Manner of disposing in America of the offal of the cattle sent as dead meat to England; hearts and livers only sold for food, *Giblett* 2631. 2665–2667. 2745–2750——Sale of the offal in New York at an average price of 6 *s.* per bullock, *ib.* 2761–2765.

Description of the parts of the bullock which are known as offal; the value of offal in a carcase worth 20 *l.* is about 15 *s.* or 16 *s.*, *Lyon* 3469–3472 ——Explanation as to the weight of offal in relation to the rest of the carcase, *Lambert* 4194–4197 ——Much lower price at which the lower classes can buy offal than American meat, *Gebhardt* 5668, 5669——Reference to the use made of offal in America, *Adams* 7984, 7985.

Doubt as to the expediency of preventing the import of offal and hides, and dead meat, on account of the risk of import of disease thereby, *Gamgee* 7158–7165. 7223–7226.

Oporto (*Export of Cattle to England*). See *Spain and Portugal.*

Orders of Council. See *Privy Council.*

Origin and Spread of Disease. See *Cattle Plague. Foot-and-Mouth Disease. Pleuro-pneumonia.*

Oxfordshire. Action taken by the local authority of the county under the Cattle Plague Order of January 1877, *App.* 564, 565.

P.

Payne, William. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is a cattle salesman at Romford; deals largely in the supply of cows to the London dairy sheds, 10464, 10465 ——Submits particulars in connection with the dairy shed in Bethnal Green, in which cattle plague has recently appeared; supplied two cows to this shed, but they were perfectly healthy, and he cannot account for the origin of the outbreak, 10466-10488. 10499-10522. 10534-10541.

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Payne, William. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

Constant shifting of the cows in the London dairies; practice in some cases of supplying cows without payment on delivery, though witness never adopts this plan, 10482–10495. 10530–10533——Approval of an inspection of the dairies, in conjunction with strict regulations as to movement, 10496–10498——Large number of cows which pass through witness' hands; he never buys Dutch cows unless they have been in the country for a year or two, 10523–10530.

Peel, Charles Lennox. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is Clerk of the Privy Council; submits the orders and regulations having reference to the outbreak of cattle plague in the present year, 2604–2611——Important order limiting the number of ports at which cattle can be landed, 2612.

[Second Examination.]—Orders of Council which have been passed since the Committee of 1873, handed in by witness; these orders represent a complete history of the action of the Privy Council in regard to cattle plague, 3809-3813.

[Third Examination.]—Explanation of the recent action of the Privy Council, and of the orders now in force in the country and in the metropolis, in reference to cattle plague, &c.; cordon still maintained round the metropolis pending the re-stocking of the infected dairies, 9865-9870.

Witness submits the regulations now in force in Sweden and Norway, 9870–9872.

Penalties. Desirability of enforcing obedience to the proposed regulations by means of severe penalties, *Brown* 538, 539——Advocacy of severer penalties in the case of those who do not fail to report cases of pleuro-pneumonia, *Lambert* 3928–3931——Expediency of a considerable increase of penalties, *Melvin* 8820.

Prohibition by the Privy Council of the acceptance of their inspectors of any portion of the fines on conviction, *Brown* 9984, 9985——Difficulty in enforcing penalties for concealment of facts; amendment desirable in this respect, *ib.* 10424–10426. 10458–10461.

Peterborough. Action taken by the local authority of the Liberty of Peterborough in February 1877, with reference to the prohibition of movement in the Liberty of Peterborough, *App.* 564.

Peters, James. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is Land Agent of Lord Fitzhardinge, 5345——Recent landing of a large quantity of cattle, sheep, and pigs at Bristol, the latter having been affected with foot-and-mouth disease, and all having been driven away together, 5346–5358. 5363-5381——Presence of two Government inspectors on the foregoing occasion; statement as to these having merely the power of reporting to the local authorities, 5353, 5354. 5366-5370. 5380, 5381. 5390–5403.

Circumstance of a cargo of Irish cattle having been landed at Sharpness Point, twenty miles above Bristol, and afterwards driven to Bristol for sale, 5359-5362. 5371-5374. 5384, 5385——Very crowded state of the Irish cattle boats; tendency to disease thereby, whilst many animals die on the voyage, 5375-5379. 5386-5389——Recent landing of sheep at Bristol suffering severely from foot-and-mouth disease, 5381–5383.

Pigs. Occasional failure of detection of foot-and-mouth disease in the case of swine, inasmuch as they do not show the disease so markedly as other animals, and are more difficult to examine, *Brown* 49, 50——Reluctance of Gloucestershire farmers to buy pigs for fattening through fear of foot-and-mouth disease, *Lord Fitzhardinge* 5281–5284——Pigs introduce disease more commonly than cattle, *Brown* 10017.

Number of pigs bred by witness and exported to the Continent and Ireland, in order to improve the breeds for the London market, *Howard* 8313.

Pleuro-Pneumonia:

1. *Origin of the Disease in this Country; Weight of Evidence as to its Introduction from Abroad.*
2. *Long Period of Incubation.*
3. *Prevalence of the Disease; Losses entailed.*
4. *Suggestions as to the Restrictions to be enforced.*
5. *Regulations of the Privy Council.*
6. *Conclusions of the Committee.*

1. *Origin of the Disease in this Country; Weight of Evidence as to its Introduction from Abroad:*

Inference as to pleuro-pneumonia having been imported; existence, however, of the disease in England previously to foreign import, *Brown* 290, 291——Pleuro-pneumonia more frequently introduced than foot-and-mouth disease, on account of the impossibility of the disease being detected in the stage of incubation, *ib.* 517–522.

Belief that foreign importation has not materially increased pleuro-pneumonia, *Simonds* 1110–1128. 1227. 1314–1318——Possible introduction of pleuro-pneumonia in the first instance by means of Dutch cows *viâ* Ireland, *ib.* 1120–1121——Belief that the disease may be generated in this country, *Swan* 1773–1776.

Report, 1877—continued.

PLEURO-PNEUMONIA—continued.

1. *Origin of the Disease in this Country, &c.*—continued.

Belief that pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease are foreign diseases, notwithstanding that they may to a certain extent have become acclimatised in England, *Booth* 2381-2385. 2420; *Lyon* 3186 *et seq.*; *Sheldon* 4541-4563——Import of pleuro-pneumonia into this country for the first time in 1840 or 1841, through some Dutch cows which came to Ireland, *Sheldon* 4557-4562. 4610-4612 —— Doubt as to pleuro-pneumonia originating otherwise than by contagion, *Wilson* 4984-4989.

Practical experience upon which witness concludes that pleuro-pneumonia arises spontaneously and cannot be stamped out by restrictions, *Gebhardt* 5172-5178. 5674. 5677. 5713-5715——Reported outbreak of pleuro-pneumonia in Cornwall, said to have come from Ireland, *ib.* 5178-5181.

Liability to the import of pleuro-pneumonia by means of the cows brought over from Holland for dairy purposes, *Pool* 5905-5914; *Robinson* 8610-8617; *Read* 9501-9503 ——Belief that pleuro-pneumonia is not contagious; practical experience on which witness grounds this conclusion, *Pool* 5914. 5916-5950. 6035. 6040.

Conclusion as to pleuro-pneumonia coming entirely from abroad, *Gamgee* 7169-7173. 7204, 7205; *Howard* 8191-8196. 8411-8413; *Melvin* 8777——The real invasion of this country by the disease dates from 1842, *Gamgee* 7171——Opinion as to pleuro-pneumonia in this country not being necessarily introduced by foreign cattle, *Odams* 8111-8113.

Belief that the disease can only be communicated by the direct contact of one living animal with another, *Read* 9585 — Grounds for the conclusion that pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease originally came into England from abroad, *ib.* 9616-9620.

2. *Long Period of Incubation:*

Impossibility, by any system of quarantine or inspection, to guard against pleuro-pneumonia, on account of the long period which elapses before development, *Brown* 52-54. 517-522——Difficulty in stamping out pleuro-pneumonia on account of the impossibility of detecting it in its earliest stages, *ib.* 666-670.

Dissent from the veterinary opinion that pleuro-pneumonia remains dormant and cannot be detected for two or three weeks, *Lyon* 3290, 3291 ——Enhanced danger in the case of pleuro-pneumonia, on account of the lengthened time taken in the development of the disease, *Wilson* 4716-4718. 4835-4837; *Soulby* 7311-7316——Illustration of the insidious character of pleuro-pneumonia, and of the long period of incubation, *Wilson* 4835-4837.

3. *Prevalence of the Disease; Losses entailed:*

Concurrence of evidence as to the prevalence of pleuro pneumonia in the dairies and cowsheds in London and other large towns, *Brown* 549-553; *Swan* 1693-1696; *Lambert* 3932-3939; *Wilson* 4833-4835. 4851, 4852; *Gebhardt* 5438-5440; *Gamgee* 6945.

Evidence as to the excessive mortality from the disease in towns; annual loss of fifty-four and a-half per cent, of the cows in town dairies when witness made inquiries on the subject, *Gamgee* 7043-7055. 7065-7074——Frequent losses of witness from pleuro-pneumonia previously to the cattle plague regulations; probable causes of the stoppage of the disease, *Melvin* 8730-8734——Relative prevalence of pleuro-pneumonia and of foot-and-mouth disease in May 1877, *Brown* 10274, 10275. 10281.

4. *Suggestions as to the Restrictions to be enforced:*

Evidence in detail as to the means to be adopted for stamping out both pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease; necessity for giving larger and more elastic powers to the Privy Council, *Brown* 303-313. 335-344. 513-516. 523-526. 530-548. 552-555. 650. 785-791——Approval of slaughtering without hesitation all animals that show any evidence of pleuro-pneumonia, *ib.* 554——Opinion that the time during which the pleuro-pneumonia rules should be applied to premises in which the disease has been discovered should be extended from thirty days to two months; necessity for an Act of Parliament to make this change, *ib.* 589-593.

Argument that pleuro-pneumonia should come under the same regulations as foot-and-mouth disease or cattle plague, *Booth* 2409, 2410. 2414-2417——Conclusion as to the expediency of slaughtering immediately in the case of pleuro-pneumonia; the animals are never of any use if they live after the disease, *Lyon* 3186-3204. 3273-3291. 3305. 3320——Opinion that the lung disease has gained such a hold in this country that it would be nearly impossible to stamp it out; animals suffering from the disease are very much affected by changes of climate, such as are common in England, *ib.* 3199-3202.

Belief that in 1865-66 pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease were for a time entirely stamped out; opinion that it would be quite feasible to stamp those diseases out in

Report, 1877—*continued.*

PLEURO-PNEUMONIA—continued.

4. *Suggestions as to the Restrictions to be enforced*—continued.

in the future, *Rea* 3595-3598. 3600, 3601. 3726-3730——Necessity for very stringent regulations for the purpose of stamping out pleuro-pneumonia; belief that such restrictions, if they succeeded, would be a benefit to the country generally, by increasing the amount of the home supply, *Lambert* 3908-3912. 3922-3944. 3950-3953. 4178-4180——Further suggestions as to the increased stringency required in the regulations with the object of eradicating pleuro-pneumonia; approval of the present restrictions if foreign governments could be relied upon to transmit telegraphic information as to any outbreak, *ib.* 4141-4147.

Importance of accurate scientific knowledge in dealing with cases of pleuro-pnemonia, *Wilson* 4804—— Objection to the prohibition of import from any country on the score of pleuro-pneumonia, *Giblett* 6571-6576. 6615.

Positive and definite character of the restrictions required as regards pleuro-pneumonia, the stoppage of import being essential, *Gamgee* 6971-6975——Necessity of isolation and other preventive home measures for pleuro-pneumonia, but only for a time, if foreign import be stopped, *ib.* 7056, 7057——Conclusion that in a very limited period of time, such as six months, pleuro-pneumonia might be stamped out, *ib.* 7174-7176.

Improved regulations desirable as regards slaughter and isolation in the case of pleuro-pneumonia, *Soulby* 7273-7275. 7282-7284——Opinion that in cases of pleuro-pneumonia movement should be prohibited for three months out of the infected locality, *Melvin* 8812-8817.

Extent to which the recommendations of the Select Committee of 1873 in reference to pleuro-pneumonia have been carried out, *Read* 9501——Contemplated extension of the period of isolation for pleuro-pneumonia from twenty-eight days to two months, *ib.* 9509-9514. 9720-9723. 9771-9773——Facility of extirpating pleuro-pneumonia by proper restrictions, witness contending that this disease never arises spontaneously, *ib.* 9603. 9619, 9620. 9661-9664.

Doubt as to any practicable means of extirpating pleuro-pneumonia in six months, *Brown* 9897. 9901, 9902——Statement to the effect that pleuro-pneumonia has not been diminished by the restrictions in force in reference to cattle plague, *ib.* 9895, 9896——Summary of the home restrictions desirable in reference to pleuro-pneumonia, in conjunction with a system of slaughtering at the ports, *ib.* 10067-10069. 10101, 10102——Necessary lapse of some years before the country could be pronounced free from pleuro-pneumonia; experience of Holland to this effect, *ib.* 10093. 10267-10271.

5. *Regulations of the Privy Council:*

Regulations laid down in the various Orders of Council since August 1873, with reference to pleuro-pneumonia, *App.* 512 *et seq.*

6. *Conclusions of the Committee:*

Great risk of the import of pleuro-pneumonia on account of the long period for which it lies dormant, *Rep.* iv——Conclusion as to the home restrictions necessary in reference to the disease; suggestion that absolute prohibition of movement be enforced against infected farms for two months, *ib.* v, ix, x——Summary of the regulations and restrictions proposed, *ib.* ix, x.

See also *Bedfordshire. Cows. Dairies and Cowsheds. Denmark. Fairs and Markets. Farmers. Foot-and-Mouth Disease,* 1. *Foreign Cattle. Germany,* 8. *Holland. Home Supply. Inoculation. Inspection. Ireland, &c.,* 8. *Movement of Cattle. Privy Council. Quarantine.*

Police. See *Inspection,* 4.

Pool, Marcus. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is a cattle salesman, doing business both in the Islington and Deptford markets, 5786-5788——Explanation that Mr. Swan, of Edinburgh, is interested much more largely in the home than foreign trade, 5788, 5789——Considerable falling off in the supply of foreign animals at the Deptford Market, the present supply from Holland and France being very small, 5790-5813——Very few buyers, and very little competition, at Deptford, the retail butchers not having slaughter-houses there; prejudicial effect as regards the supply from abroad, 5791. 5796-5805. 6072 6077.

Examination as to the effect of compulsory slaughter at Deptford in tending to reduce the foreign supply and to increase the price in this country, and as to the effect, on the other hand, of the American dead-meat supply in keeping down the price, 5814-5826——Grounds for the conclusion that continued restrictions on free trade in foreign cattle will cause foreigners to reduce their stocks, and not to send them to this country, 5820-5834. 5840-5844. 6068-6070.

Less dependence on foreign supplies if farmers in England had increased their stocks instead of growing so much corn and other produce, 5835-5838——Belief that cattle

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Pool, Marcus. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

epidemics cannot be prevented by stopping foreign import, 5837——Opinion that foreign import should be entirely stopped from all countries which cannot show a clean bill of health, 5838. 6001, 6002——Expediency on the other hand of complete free trade with all healthy countries, the cattle being allowed to go to a public market instead of being slaughtered at Deptford, 5838, 5839. 6003-6009. 6039-6044. 6072-6081.

Evidence in support of the conclusion that the price of dead meat from America will increase, and that this supply cannot be depended upon in lieu of a live cattle supply from the continent, 5839-5895. 5960-5979. 6010-6034. 6082-6104——Unsatisfactory results of witness' experience as regards the condition in which several consignments of American meat have arrived; question considered whether the difficulties on this score may not be overcome in time, 5847-5869. 5960-5970. 6033, 6034. 6057-6066. 6096-6099.

Average of about 4¾*d.* per pound realised by the American meat sold by witness; examination hereon to the effect that witness does not believe the trade is a remunerative one, notwithstanding its immense increase, 5857-5860. 5870-5880. 6010-6032. 6095——Opinion that a dead-meat trade exclusively would not suit the wants of the retail butchers; reference hereon to the extent of purchases in the Metropolitan Dead Meat Market, 5884-5895.

Concurrence in a suggestion by Mr. Gebhardt that animals sold at the Islington market should only go into the country for slaughter, 5896-5905——Exception taken to the view that there are worse hotbeds of disease in London than in the country, 5896-5899——Consideration of the extent to which cows with pleuro-pneumonia are imported from Holland into the London dairy sheds, 5905-5914.

Belief that pleuro-pneumonia is not contagious; practical experience on which witness grounds this conclusion, 5914. 5916-5950. 6035. 6040——Approval of inspection before an animal is removed from a dairy shed, 5915, 5916——Conviction of witness that foot-and-mouth disease is atmospheric, 5951, 5952. 6041——Interest of witness in the import of live cattle, though he would not allow them to come if there were real danger of disease thereby, 5953-5959.

Examination as to the relative loss or deterioration in the case of dead meat cargoes and of live cattle cargoes, 5960-5970. 6022. 6045-6049——Tendency to a rise in the price of cattle in America; reference hereon to the margin of profit between the price of dead meat in New York and in London, 5971-5979. 6010-6020——Evidence as to the difficulty on the score of supplies of ice and disposal of offal which are likely to prevent a Continental dead meat trade, 5980-6000.

Further statement that there should be free trade and an open market, except for cattle from countries where there is contagious disease; question hereon as to the diseases which are contagious, 6001-6009. 6035-6044. 6078, 6079——Conclusion that Deptford Market should be abolished altogether, 6008, 6009. 6072-6077.

Tendency to reduction of price in France if foreign cattle be excluded from England; question whether this might not induce foreign producers to send dead meat to this country, 6050-6056——Probable gluts in the market if supplied entirely by foreign dead meat; impracticability of regulating the supply, 6080, 6081. 6100-6104.

Ports (*Landing of Foreign Cattle*). Precautions taken at landing places as to separating the defined from the undefined parts of the port; unfavourable opinion as to the arrangements at some of the ports, *Brown* 36-40——Explanation with regard to the limitation of parts where foreign animals are allowed to be landed, as recommended by the Select Committee of 1873, *ib.* 753-762——Enumeration of the ports which have been closed and those which have been left open for the debarkation of cattle, *ib.* 1053-1056.

Important Order of Council limiting the number of ports at which cattle can be landed, *Peel* 2612.

There should be certain defined ports, *Rudkin* 8959——Limitation desirable as regards the number of ports of debarkation, *Read* 9687-9690——Limitation desirable to be placed on the number of ports, unless proper slaughtering arrangements be made, *Brown* 10233, 10234.

List of ports at which foreign cattle might be landed under the Animals Order of 1875, *App.* 529, 530.

Alterations by the Privy Council from time to time in reference to the ports of entry at which foreign cattle may be landed, *App.* 539 *et seq.*

Proposed definition of the ports of debarkation at which foreign cattle may be landed for slaughter, *Rep.* vi.

See also *Deptford Market.* *Foreign Cattle.* *Quarantine.*

Portugal. See *Spain and Portugal.*

Post-mortem Examinations. Statement that a post-mortem examination is not always infallible in determining the existence of disease; difference of opinion between witness and Mr. Duguid upon this point, *Brown* 233–236.

PRICE OF MEAT:

1. *As to Past and Present Prices, and the Causes of Increase.*
2. *As to the Effect of a Prohibition upon Import, and of Compulsory Slaughter at the Home or Foreign Port.*

1. *As to Past and Present Prices, and the Causes of Increase:*

Statement that the present severe restrictions as regards foreign cattle considerably enhance the price of meat; large increase in the price in the last ten or fifteen years, *Booth* 2256. 2308. 2315, 2316. 2320, 2321. 2327–2331 —— Explanation as to the relative prices of meat sold wholesale and retail, *Hall* 3043–3048——Average price at which beef is imported alive from the Continent, *Lyon* 3249–3252 —— Price of English meat slightly reduced on account of the introduction of the American, *ib.* 3345.

Opinion that the outbreak of cattle plague in 1865–66 had a very great tendency to raise the price of meat; belief that this increase has continued ever since, *Rea* 3584–3586——Tendency of the outbreak of cattle plague in the present year to increase prices, *ib.* 3643–3645. 3669.

Lower price by 1 *d.* or 1½ *d.* per pound of dead meat than of live cattle at Glasgow, *Hamilton* 4368–4372. 4387–4396. 4407–4416—— Statistics to the effect that the price of meat is now 1⅛ *d.* dearer per pound than it was in the two years before the outbreak of the cattle plague in 1865, *Wilson* 4742–4745——Other causes besides the cattle plague of 1865 to which the subsequent increase in the price of meat may be attributable, *ib.* 4899–4901. 5087–5094.

Much higher price of meat but for the import from America, *Gebhardt* 5252, 5253 ——Effect of the restriction upon import of live stock in raising the price of common or contractors' meat, *Burkett* 6254–6260.

Considerable and continuous rise in the price of meat, the increase of population and of demand being one cause, and the restriction upon import of live stock another cause, *Giblett* 6596–6604. 6694. 6721 ——Uncertain profit realised by cattle from the Continent, *ib.* 6657–6660—— Effect of the losses from rinderpest and other diseases in limiting the supply of cattle and in enhancing the price, *ib.* 6695–6697.

Effect of the charges of salesmen, middlemen, and others, in adding to the price of meat, *Giblett* 6729–6732——Good price obtained by the English farmer, notwithstanding the effect of the American meat supply, *ib.* 6675–6678——Depression in the prices of live cattle when dead meat comes in very large quantities, *ib.* 6745, 6746.

Increased price of meat in Liverpool through the cattle plague restrictions; check through the American supply, *Luya* 7616–7621—— Considerable increase in the price of meat at Leeds during the last thirty years, the consumption having greatly increased; doubt as to the losses from cattle plague having influenced the price, *Walker* 7830–7837. 7845–7850. 7881–7884. 7930, 7931——Probable increase in the price of meat in other countries as well as under the legislation in force in England, *Odams* 8046–8051—— Effect of the cattle plague in increasing generally the price of meat, *Rudkin* 9197.

2. *As to the Effect of a Prohibition upon Import, and of Compulsory Slaughter at the Home or Foreign Port:*

Grounds for the opinion that dead meat could not be sent to England from the continent at the same low price as from America, *Brown* 365–371——Probable increase in the price of meat which would result from the stoppage of the importation of live stock, *ib.* 896, 897——Probable effect of the prohibition of foreign cattle upon the price, *Simonds* 1227–1231. 1275–1277——Advantageous effect upon the price by the total prohibition of live cattle from infected countries, *Booth* 2449–2454.

Increase in the price of meat which would necessarily arise from the prohibition of importation of live cattle from abroad, *Lyon* 3503, 3504——Dissent from the opinion that restrictions would have the effect of increasing the price of meat; belief that beef will be lower in price if the dead meat trade is followed out, *Rea* 3746–3751. 3801, 3802——Opinion that the closing of foreign ports would not have the immediate effect of raising the price, *ib.* 3676–3769.

Tendency to a reduction rather than an increase of price by stopping the import of foreign cattle; that is, through the increased import of dead meat and the increase of breeding, *Wilson* 4902, 4903. 4918–4920. 4990.

Belief that the price in London and all over England would be raised if all live cattle from the Continent were excluded, *Gebhardt* 5473, 5474——Slight difference in price which would divert foreign sheep and cattle to Paris instead of to London, *ib.* 5475–5479——Considerable margin at present for a reduction of prices, as by an increased

Report, 1877—*continued.*

PRICE OF MEAT—continued.

2. *As to the Effect of a Prohibition upon Import, &c.*—continued.

import of American meat, *Gebhardt* 5508, 5509——Tendency of slaughter at the port to increase the price in England and to reduce it in France and Germany, *ib.* 5562–5564. 5570–5580. 5590–5596——Effect of slaughtering at Deptford in making meat dearer in the country, and for a time cheaper in London, *ib.* 5573–5576. 5581–5589. 5689–5692. 5754. 5773.

Examination upon the question whether the price in Birmingham and other provincial towns has really been enhanced through the necessity of slaughtering foreign cattle at Deptford; tendency of the American supply to check increased prices, *Gebhardt* 5633–5647. 5696–5700——Probable reduction for a time in the price of meat by an increased import from America concurrently with the import of live stock, *ib.* 5782–5785.

Examination as to the effect of compulsory slaughter at Deptford in tending to reduce the foreign supply and to increase the price in this country, and as to the effect on the other hand of the American dead meat supply in keeping down the price, *Pool* 5814–5826.

Tendency to reduction of price by stopping the import of live cattle if dead meat came in increased quantities from the Continent and from America, and if there be increased breeding of English cattle, *Burkett* 6273–6276. 6333, 6334. 6449–6459——Increase in the price of meat if the import of live cattle be prohibited unless dead meat should be substituted for the live supply; difficulty as to such substitution permanently in the case of the Continent but not of America, *ib.* 6361–6367. 6404–6439. 6445–6479.

Belief that the total exclusion of foreign cattle would make meat fabulously dear, *Giblett* 6612 6614. 6752——Statement as to the price of meat not having risen upon the stoppage of import of German and Dutch cattle, *Stratton* 6805–6808. 6880. 6893–6901.

Belief that the price of meat would not be affected to the extent of one farthing a pound by at once excluding foreign cattle, *Gamgee* 7099, 7100. 7112–7115——Expectation that prices will in time be much lower by the adoption of witness' proposals, *ib.* 7124. 7136.

Reduction of price, to the great benefit of the community, if increased quantities of meat be imported from America, *Howard* 8307–8309——Dissent from the view that slaughtering at Deptford would make meat dear in the country and cheap in London, *Rudkin* 9157, 9158.

Belief that the price of meat is never likely to fall to 5 *d.* or 6 *d.* per pound as a result of the entire exclusion of foreign cattle, *Brown* 10034–10036——Effect of the total prohibition of the import of live stock in increasing the price; that is, until arrangements were made for a dead-meat trade in conjunction with slaughtering at the ports, *ib.* 10034. 10037–10040——Opinion that in course of time the price would be diminished rather than increased by a prohibition upon the import of live stock, 10218, 10219. 10228——Probability of a better class of animals being sent from abroad if slaughter on arrival be compulsory; effect upon the price of meat to the lower classes, *ib.* 10235–10241. 10245–10247.

Grounds upon which the Committee conclude that compulsory slaughter at the port of debarkation would not result in any increase generally in the price of meat, *Rep.* vi, vii.

See also *American Cattle.* *American Dead Meat*, VII. *Dead Meat.* *Home Supply.* *Offal.*

PRIVY COUNCIL:

Summary of the measures adopted by the Veterinary Department relative to the cattle plague since the last outbreaks in 1865, 1866, and 1867; reference especially to the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act passed in 1869, *Brown* 2–8——Evidence in support of the conclusion that in cases of cattle plague the Privy Council should entirely supersede the local authorities, *ib.* 154. 166–168. 984–988——Conclusion as regards the measures necessary for dealing with pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease, that larger and more elastic powers should be given to the Privy Council, *ib.* 523 *et seq.*; 785–791.

Desirability of vesting all the responsibility and all the power in the Privy Council, and taking it away from the local authority; that is, in cases of cattle plague, *Simonds* 1213–1215; *Rea* 3653–3655. 3788, 3789. 3796–3798; *Lambert* 3913–3916——Importance of the regulations in this country being entirely under the control of the Privy Council, instead of their being enforced by local authorities, *Gebhardt* 2155–2161. 2171.

Conclusion as to the necessity of central and uniform action for the enforcement of regulations and restrictions, *Lambert* 3913–3916; *Wilson* 4696–4700. 4756–4760. 5101, 5102; *Melvin* 8803–8809——Objection to farmers being free to deal with foot-and-mouth disease without control by a central department, *Wilson* 4949–4953.

Expediency

Report, 1877—*continued.*

PRIVY COUNCIL—continued.

Expediency of all regulations and restrictions resting with the Privy Council, *Giblett* 6579, 6580——Approval of very full powers in the Privy Council for dealing with cases of cattle plague, *Stratton* 6809.

Suggestion that the Privy Council should issue all the orders to be carried out, and should so far supersede the local authorities, but that the latter should see to the carrying out of the orders by their own officers, *Soulby* 7248–7253——Advisability of uniformity in local regulations, and of Privy Council Orders being imperative, *Howard* 8212. 8222, 8223. 8226–8228. 8238. 8287–8290. 8297——Proposal that the Privy Council should issue uniform regulations and that a central board should appoint its own officers to carry them out, *Smith* 8472–8476.

Importance generally of immediate and compulsory action on the part of the Privy Council, irrespectively of the local authorities, *Read* 9491–9493. 9498, 9499——Expediency of strengthening the regulations of the Privy Council as to compensation, &c., and of extending them to Ireland, *ib.* 9588–9593——Independent powers to be exercised by the Privy Council in the event of a fresh outbreak of cattle plague, *ib.* 9753–9755.

Importance of the regulations of the Privy Council being applicable to the United Kingdom so that Ireland and Scotland as well as England may be bound by them, *Brown* 9978–9983——Expediency of the Privy Council having full powers through their inspectors to act at once in requiring the slaughter of animals without referring the matter to the local authority or the local inspectors; case in point, *ib.* 9991–9996.

Examination in further support of the proposal that the central authority should have power to require their regulations being carried out by the local authorities, *Brown* 10150–10184——Statement as to the Privy Council not having attempted to enforce the powers of their inspectors as regards interference with the local authority; expediency of means being provided for the enforcement of such powers by the central department, *ib.* 10276–10280.

Order of Council in August 1873 with reference to the steps to be taken in cases of pleuro-pneumonia and of foot-and-mouth disease respectively, *App.* 512–514.

Subsequent Orders, dated 13th November 1873, 27th February 1874, 3rd June 1874, 7th August 1874, and 5th June 1875, *App.* 514–518——List of Orders revoked by the Order of 5th June 1875, *ib.* 519.

Further Orders of Council from time to time, together with the regulations laid down, *App.* 521–565. 604, 605.

Letter from Mr. Wilmot, dated 11th November 1876, submitting the views of the Lord President in reference to the measures advocated in memorial from the Central Chamber of Agriculture and the Farmers' Club, *App.* 566, 567.

Orders of Council of 18th and 19th July 1877, imposing restrictions upon movement in the metropolis in view of the further outbreak of cattle plague, *App.* 604, 605.

Grounds for the recommendation by the Committee that uniform rules, applicable to all districts declared infected, should be enforced by the local authority, subject to the supervision of the Privy Council, *Rep.* iii. v. ix.

Recommendation that the Privy Council be empowered to deal directly with the cattle plague whenever it appears in this country, and that for this purpose it should receive from the local authority immediate notice of every outbreak, *Rep.* iii. ix.

Power proposed to be reserved to the Privy Council to forbid importation from countries other than those made the subject of legislation, *Rep.* ix.

See also *Cattle Plague. Foot-and-Mouth Disease. Foreign Cattle. Inspection. Local Authorities. Movement of Cattle. Pleuro-Pneumonia.*

Prohibition of Import. See *Foreign Cattle.*

Prussia. See *Germany.*

Q.

QUARANTINE:

Impossibility of establishing a practical system of quarantine, *Brown* 792–797——Doubtful expediency of establishing a system of quarantine in regard to store stock coming to this country from countries which are now unscheduled, *Simonds* 1133, 1134. 1239–1244.

Desirability of establishing a system of quarantine of from seven to fourteen days in regard to store cattle; suggestion that the quarantine station should be situated a good way down the river, somewhere on the coast of Essex, *Lyon* 3205–3211. 3274. 3363–3365——Approval of the twelve hours' quarantine which is at present in force in the case of foreign cattle, *Lambert* 3917. 3921. 3925.

Suggestions by the Central Chamber of Agriculture for the establishment of quarantine grounds, *Stratton* 6788——Advantage of quarantine stations at certain ports, to be used as regards foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia, *ib.* 6831–6833. 6854.

Report, 1877—*continued.*

QUARANTINE—continued.

Reluctant approval of a system of quarantine for store cattle; very stringent regulations desirable in connection therewith, *Gamgee* 7006–7011——Consideration of the question of quarantine as applicable to store cattle and milch cows, witness submitting that a quarantine of two months might be enforced, *Howard* 8256–8272. 8294–8296. 8314. 8373–8377.

Difficulty in carrying out a two months' quarantine, *Robinson* 8693–8695——Impracticability of an effective system of quarantine, *Melvin* 8857.

Quarantine of fourteen days recommended by the Metropolitan Dairymen's Society, *Tisdall* 9363, 9364——Question considered as to a quarantine of fourteen days being sufficient as regards pleuro-pneumonia, *ib.* 9365–9368. 9389–9394. 9473, 9474——Beneficial operation of a system of quarantine, notwithstanding the cost involved; conclusion that such cost should be borne in the first instance by the vendor, *ib.* 9442–9444. 9453–9469. 9482.

Suggestion for applying a fourteen days' quarantine to cows from Holland, and to store cattle generally, *Read* 9506–9508——Advantage of quarantine stations at Harwich, Southampton, and other places, *ib.* 9689. 9729, 9730——Objection to quarantine being extended to fat cattle, *ib.* 9740–9743.

Increased security by a longer detention of animals before they are landed, *Brown* 9932, 9933——Conclusion as to the serious interference with trade by a system of quarantine of Dutch cows, *ib.* 10075–10079. 10198.

Recommendation by the Committee as regards store and dairy animals, that they remain in quarantine for fourteen days, and afterwards be placed under inspection for two months, *Rep.* vi. ix.

R.

Railways. Great cruelty under the present system of conveyance of cattle by railway; outrage upon humanity now involved, *Odams* 8020–8022——Improved regulations for the cleansing of railway trucks; great neglect, however, in other respects, *ib.* 8130–8135——Statement as to water not being provided at many stations, *ib.* 8134, 8135. 8142–8144.

Amended system of inspection desirable as regards railway-borne cattle from Scotland, *Brown* 10120–10122——Information as to the action of the Privy Council in reference to the cleansing of cattle-trucks by the railway companies; obstacles thereto, *ib.* 10186–10195.

Regulations prescribed by the Animals Order of 1875 as to the arrangements in connection with transit by railway, *App.* 527, 528.

List of railway stations at which water is to be provided for animals according to the Order of Council of June 1875, *App.* 534–538.

See also *American Dead Meat*, VI. *Dead Meat.* *Transit of Cattle.*

Rea, George. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is a farmer in the north of England holding a very large acreage; has been largely occupied for several years as a cattle breeder, 3573–3578. 3613–3617——Information as to the number of sheep and cattle possessed by witness; his operations are almost wholly confined to breeding cattle to sell to others to fatten, 3579–3583. 3587.

Opinion that the outbreak of cattle plague in 1865–66 had a very great tendency to raise the price of meat; belief that this increase has continued ever since, 3584–3586——Tendency of the fear of disease to keep down the stock, and consequently the supply of meat to the country, 3588. 3591.

Absence of pleuro-pneumonia on witness' farm on account of his keeping away from the markets when that disease was prevalent, 3589–3591——Serious losses experienced from foot-and-mouth disease; approval of more stringent restrictions in the case of this disease, 3592–3594. 3630–3636. 3646–3655——Belief that in 1865–66 pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease were for a time entirely stamped out; opinion that it would be quite feasible to stamp those disease out in the future, 3595–3598. 3600, 3601. 3726–3730.

Opinion that the farmers throughout the country would be quite willing to submit to any restrictions having the object of stamping out disease effectually; readiness to submit even to such stringent regulations as were in force in regard to the cattle plague, 3599–3601. 3637–3642. 3686, 3687. 3716–3724. 3731. 3745. 3789——Effect of stringent regulations, which should stamp out disease, in increasing the supply of meat for consumption, because farmers would increase their stocks, 3602–3606. 3656.

Expediency

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Rea, George. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

Expediency of prohibiting the import of cattle from abroad in conjunctiou with severe restrictions at home; legitimate complaint which the farmers would have if severe restrictions were imposed at home, without dealing with the fountain head of the disease, which is importation from the Continent, 3607-3612. 3660-3664. 3669. 3675-3679. 3704-3715. 3734-3736. 3764. 3770-3782. 3790-3796——Effect of the cattle plague of 1865 upon witness' occupation as a breeder of cattle; in the absence of proper steps to protect the farming interest from cattle plague, witness will stock more with sheep than with cattle, 3613-3629.

Tendency of the outbreak of cattle plague in the present year to increase the price of meat, 3643-3645. 3669——Opinion that where foot-and-mouth disease is prevalent in any district the fairs and markets should be closed; approval of compulsory orders from the Privy Council on this subject throughout the kingdom, 3650-3654. 3662, 3663. 3798——Desirability of vesting all the responsibility and all the power in the Privy Council, and taking it away from the local authority, 3653-3655. 3788, 3789. 3796-3798.

Argument that the outbreak of cattle plague has affected the supply of cattle in the future as well as at the present time, on account of the loss of breeding cows, 3656-3659——Recommendation that Irish cattle should be treated in the same way as English cattle, and with the same restrictions, 3665-3667——Very little cattle plague in England since the great outbreak of 1865; 3674——Improbability of introducing disease by means of importation of dead meat, 3680-3682. 3738-3744——Introduction of the first outbreak of cattle plague from abroad, 3683-3685.

Belief that if the importation of live cattle from the Continent were stopped a sufficient supply of dead meat would come in its place, 3689-3698——Opinion that cattle plague is more to be dreaded by the farmers than pleuro-pneumonia, 3699-3703——Disapproval of establishing a system of English inspectors at foreign ports; arbitrary regulations in America in regard to the cattle plague, 3741, 3742.

Dissent from the opinion that restrictions would have the effect of increasing the price of meat; belief that beef will be lower in price if the dead-meat trade is followed out, 3746-3751. 3801, 3802——Further observations to the effect that a successful dead-meat trade is quite possible with the Continent and America, 3752-3758.

Additional advocacy of prohibiting the import of foreign live stock; assertion that if this import is stopped it will be quite possible to supply the deficiency by home produce, 3759-3763. 3799, 3800——Opinion that the closing of foreign ports would not have the immediate effect of raising the price of meat, 3766-3769.

Further statement that the fear of the cattle plague has induced witness, during the last ten years, to breed less cattle than he otherwise would have done, 3783-3787——Decided opinion that the prohibition of the importation of foreign cattle would be a benefit and not a loss to the country, 3803-3805——Additional explanation that a large diminution in the breeding of cattle resulted from the outbreak of cattle plague in 1865; 3806-3808.

Read, Clare Sewell (Member of the House). (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Long and practical experience of witness as a farmer; independent footing on which he is prepared to give evidence, he not being a member of the Committee, and not appearing in any representative capacity, 9486-9488.

Recapitulation of the circumstances connected with the recent introduction of cattle plague by means of the cargo of the "Castor"; undue delay on the part of the Privy Council in exercising their powers under the Act of 1869; 9489-9493——Delay in the disinfection of the "Castor"; belief that the disease did not break out from Deptford Market, but was conveyed by the ship to Limehouse, 9489. 9524-9525. 9727.

Importance generally of immediate and compulsory action on the part of the Privy Council, irrespectively of the local authorities, 9491-9493. 9498, 9499——Suggestions for the payment of compensation out of the Consolidated Fund in respect of animals slaughtered for cattle plague, 9493. 9499, 9500——Little, if any, reliance to be placed upon inspection, whether local or central, as a means of guarding against the import of disease, 9495-9497.

Extent to which the recommendations of the Select Committee of 1873 in reference to pleuro-pneumonia have been carried out, 9501——Liability to the import of pleuro-pneumonia by means of the cows brought over from Holland for dairy purposes, 9501-9503——Expediency of restricting rather than prohibiting the import of Dutch cows, 9504, 9505. 9513——Suggestion for applying a fourteen days' quarantine to cows from Holland, and to store cattle generally, 9506-9508. 9517. 9643-9646. 9696, 9697. 9729, 9730. 9770, 9771——Contemplated extension of the period of isolation for pleura-pneumonia from twenty-eight days to two months, 9509-9514. 9720-9723. 9771-9773.

Opinion that a dead-meat trade is the safest and best, and that such trade will gradually increase so as to eventually supersede the import of live cattle, 9515, 9516——

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Read, Clare Sewell (*Member of the House*). (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

Strong advocacy of the slaughtering of all foreign fat cattle at the port of debarkation, as recommended by the Cattle Plague Commission in February 1866; 9517, 9518. 9521. 9641, 9642. 9647, 9648. 9724-9727. 9759-9764——Expediency of including sheep and pigs in the regulations as to slaughter at the port, 9519-9521.

Advantage of a separate market at Deptford for all foreign stock, 9522-9524. 9530-9532——Inconvenience in the Deptford market being held on the same day as the Islington market, 9523——Uncertainty of the supply at Deptford; a very large business is however transacted, and more slaughter-houses are being built, 9523, 9524——Comment on the action of the local authorities in Hull in reference to precautions against the spread of disease, 9525-9529.

Importance of a provision that no animal shall be moved from Islington market into the country unless it is marked for slaughter, 9533-9543. 9738, 9739——Recent instance of a very badly diseased animal in the market, 9548, 9549——Introduction of foot-and-mouth disease from the market into Norfolk on several occasions, 9540-9543. 9735-9737.

Excellent condition in which cargoes of American meat have arrived, even in hot weather; bad condition, on the other hand, of some cargoes through imperfection in the process adopted, or from other causes which are remediable, 9544-9555——Bad appearance of the American meat, owing very much to the mode of slaughtering, 9546, 9547——Importance of cool stores in which to keep the meat on arrival; steps being taken to provide these on a large scale, 9550-9553——Room for much improvement in the system of butchering in this country, 9553, 9554.

Expected permanence of the American meat trade, 9556——Probability of some live cattle being still imported from America, concurrently with dead meat, 9556-9558——Comment upon the exclusion, till lately, of American dead meat from Government contracts, 9558-9560——Successful transmission of large quantities of dead meat from Norfolk to London in hot as well as cold weather, 9561-9566——Transmission also of offal from Norfolk to London without loss, 9561. 9563. 9565.

Evidence in support of the conclusion that an improved system of inspection and increased restrictions generally on the part of Germany and other foreign countries cannot be relied upon as sufficient precaution against the export of diseased animals to England, 9567-9576. 9682, 9683. 9761-9763—— Import of many animals from Belgium and Holland with foot-and-mouth disease, in 1875, without any official intimation from those countries, 9574-9576. 9668-9670. 9761——Illustration of the laxity of inspection at Hamburg, 9570, 9571——Explanation that witness would entirely prohibit import from all countries where there is any chance of cattle plague, including not only Germany but Belgium, 9577-9579. 9649-9659. 9724-9727. 9759.

Successful results of the system of isolation and slaughter in Norfolk in reference to pleuro-pneumonia; steady diminution in the disease in the county, 9580-9582. 9639——Reduced amount of salvage paid in Norfolk on account of the value for food of the animals killed; wholesome character of the meat, 9582-9587——Comment upon the practice in Ireland of not using for food the carcases of animals attacked with pleuro-pneumonia, 9582. 9584.

Expediency of strengthening the regulations of the Privy Council as to compensation, &c., and of extending them to Ireland, 9588-9593——Importance of more stringent regulations for suppressing pleuro-pneumonia in Ireland; improvement by compensating the owner for animals killed, 9593-9597——Statement as to Norfolk being now free from foot-and-mouth-disease, 9598-9600——Tendency of this disease to die out after a time; belief that if not re-imported it could be very easily suppressed throughout the country, 9600-9603. 9660-9667——Facility also of extirpating pleuro-pneumonia by proper restrictions, witness contending that this disease never arises spontaneously, 9603. 9619, 9620. 9661-9664.

Result of witness' experience that the farmers of England would readily conform to the restrictions necessary for stamping out disease, 9604-9607. 9626. 9679—— Improved regulations enforced by the Privy Council in reference to the inland transit of cattle, 9608, 9609——Advantage of travelling or Government inspectors for seeing that the local authorities do their duty, 9609-9611. 9613-9614. 9631, 9632. 9752——Objection to the local inspectors being appointed by the Privy Council, 9610. 9631, 9632. 9752.

Considerable improvement in the state of the lairs in Ireland, 9611——Suggestion that cattle from Ireland be rested at the port of debarkation for six hours, and be fed and watered before and after leaving the railway trucks, 9611, 9612. 9692-9695. 9731-9734——Unreliability of agricultural statistics as regards the number of animals in the country, 9615——Very large number of Irish store cattle brought into Norfolk, *ib.*——Grounds for the conclusion that pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease originally came into England from abroad, 9616. 9620.

Conclusion that the restrictions and regulations hitherto have been unsuccessful only because they have not been properly applied, and that additional precautions are essential not

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Read, Clare Sewell (*Member of the House*). (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

not only as regards foreign import, but home movement, &c., 9621-9626——Importance of a limitation of the number of local authorities, and of uniformity of action throughout the whole of each county, 9627-9630.

Belief that Ireland is now free from foot-and-mouth disease, 9633. 9634——Improved condition in which the Irish cattle now arrive in Norfolk, 9635-9640——Opinion that dead meat may be safely imported from countries where there is cattle plague, 9651, 9652—— Suggestions as to the restrictions upon inland transit and upon fairs and markets which should be adopted concurrently with the slaughter of all foreign cattle at the port of debarkation, so as to exterminate foot-and-mouth disease, 9671-9679—— Approval of the continued import of German and Belgian sheep if slaughtered at the port of debarkation, 9680, 9681.

Restriction upon the spread of disease if there were an increase of slaughter-houses throughout the country, 9684-9686——Limitation desirable as regards the number of ports of debarkation, 9687-9690——Advantage of quarantine stations at Harwich, Southampton, and other places, 9689. 9729, 9730——Great improvement by supplying London and other large towns with milk from the country, exclusively, as upon the plan adopted by the Aylesbury Dairy Company, 9698-9702.

Impression as to foot-and-mouth disease being communicable to human beings, 9703, 9704——Increase of this disease in Norfolk at the time when there is most transit of Irish cattle, 9705, 9706——Expediency of cattle being rested, and fed and watered before they are embarked, 9707-9711——Doubt as to the necessity of slaughtering or quarantining cattle sent from the Channel Islands to Southampton; advantage of inspection before shipment, 9712-9716. 9748, 9749.

Modified restrictions desirable as regards the movement of store cattle in Ireland, 9717-9719——Conclusion as to dairy cows coming under the definition of store stock, 9228——Advantage of separate markets for store cattle and fat cattle in Liverpool, as well as in London, 9738, 9739——Objection to quarantine being extended to fat cattle, 9740-9743——Advantage if fat cattle were not moved into the country save in the form of dead meat, 9743-9747.

Great loss caused more especially by foot-and-mouth disease, so that effectual measures should be adopted for its isolation and suppression, 9750-9752——Independent powers to be exercised by the Privy Council in the event of a fresh outbreak of cattle plague, 9753-9755——Contemplated localisation of the restrictions upon movement in the case of foot-and-mouth disease, 9754.

Grounds for the conclusion that a much larger number of cattle would be bred in England if there were security against the import of disease, 9756, 9757——Improvement if cattle drovers were licensed; this should apply also to cattle salesmen and cattle dealers, 9758——More effectual system lately adopted in Holland for suppressing pleuro-pneumonia, 9765-9769——Non-adoption in Belgium of any special restrictions in reference to pleuro-pneumonia, 9769——Very unsatisfactory experience of witness as regards Dutch store cattle; very few of these now in Norfolk, 9774, 9775.

Refrigeration. Great importance of refrigeration in the case of milk, as well as of meat, *Wilson* 4842-4847. 4868-4870—— Room for great improvement in this country in the mode of treating meat, refrigeration being unduly neglected, *ib.* 4868-4870.

See also *American Dead Meat*, III. *Ash, Mr.* *Dead Meat*, 3.

Robinson, Anthony George. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Considerable experience of witness, as a Steamship Agent, in the import of foreign cattle, 8542-8547——Different periods of the year at which cattle are imported from Denmark, Germany, Holland, and other countries, 8548-8553—— Great diminished supply from France since the late war, 8549, 8550—— Use of ships for cattle, exclusively, from some countries, whilst from others cattle come with other cargoes, 8554——Opinion that the arrangements in the boats for cattle, exclusively, are not any better than in the cargo boats, 8555-8558.

Evidence purporting to show the entire inadequacy of inspection as a protection against the import of cattle with foot-and-mouth disease, 8559-8562——Careful inspection and expensive disinfection in connection with the Irish cattle trade, but without successful results, 8560——Complaint also as to the uncertain and unequal character of the inspection at different ports; laxity at Harwich, 8560-8566.

Undue stringency by requiring the slaughter of foreign animals at the port of embarkation, 8567. 8575. 8647, 8648. 8655—— Particulars as to the dead meat trade from Holland during the restrictions upon import of live stock in 1866; much smaller import of dead meat than of live animals when the latter were not prohibited, 8567-8578——Conclusion that cattle from all foreign countries should be slaughtered at Deptford; objection to any exception in favour of Denmark or any other country comparatively free from disease, 8579-8601. 8656-8660.

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Robinson, Anthony George. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

Regular and ample supply at Deptford if there were compulsory slaughter of all foreign animals landed in the port of London; disadvantages of the present uncertainty of supply in the market, 8579. 8586–8590. 8604–8606. 8626, 8627. 8649–8654. 8715, 8716—— Dissent from certain statements as to the loss incurred by sending cattle to Deptford to be slaughtered, 8585. 8604. 8639——Increase of slaughter-houses at Deptford, and increasing practice of butchers to buy dead meat instead of slaughtering at home, 8588, 8589. 8652–8654.

Facility in the transmission of dead meat from Deptford to the provinces, 8602–8604 —— Import of from 8,000 to 10,000 cows yearly mainly from Holland, this being practically the only import of store cattle, 8607–8609——Liability to the import of pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease by means of Dutch cows; very strict quarantine required, 8610–8617.

Very rude arrangements formerly in the transport of live stock from Ireland, but without any outbreak of disease; greatly improved arrangements now in force, 8619, 8620——Belief that diseases are not developed during the transit from Ireland, but by subsequent treatment in England; very strict checks upon the shipment of diseased animals, 8621–8625——Considerable quantities of offal formerly imported in good condition, 8628–8931. 8642——Statement showing that offal can be and is conveyed from Deptford for considerable distances without difficulty, 8632–8642.

Very large increase anticipated in the dead-meat trade from America, 8643–8646—— Calculation to the effect that American meat will bring a profit at any price over 4½ *d.* a pound, 8644. 8697, 8698——Excellent condition in which the meat may be brought under proper arrangements, 8644——Considerable losses incurred in the live cattle trade from America, so that it is likely to be superseded by the dead-meat trade, 8644–8646.

Consideration and approval of the detailed arrangements at the Port of Cork up to the point of shipment of live stock for England, 8661–8673——Satisfaction expressed also with the accommodation and arrangements on board the cattle ships from Cork, 8674–8689——Inducement to the shipowners to take every care of the cattle on account of the practice of insuring them against injury or death, 8683–8685. 8711–8714—— Excellent arrangements on board the Irish cattle ships generally, 8686.

Occasional deterioration in the dead meat formerly brought from Holland; no ice was then used, 8690–8692—— Difficulty in carrying out a two months' quarantine, 8693–8695—— Saving in the freight of dead meat, as compared with live cattle, from Holland, 8696—— Improvement much required in the mode of carting dead meat from Deptford, 8699.

Stationary character of the cattle trade with Portugal, 8700, 8701——Very good condition in which live cattle arrive from New York; opinion, nevertheless, that this import should be prohibited, 8702–8706——Obstacles to the successful conduct of a large dead-meat trade from the Continent throughout the year, 8707–8710.

Royal Agricultural Society. Resolution passed by the Council of the Society in March last in favour of the total prohibition of the import of live stock from European ports, this resolution having led to the present inquiry, *Wilson* 4692–4695—— Representations made by the Society to the Privy Council to the effect that as regards cattle the local authorities should be superseded by the latter, *ib.* 4696–4700.

Rudkin, Thomas. (Analysis of his Evidence).—Is a Member of the Common Council of the City of London; has been a member of the Markets Committee for nearly twenty years, 8928–8930.

Statement of the number of cattle, calves, sheep, and pigs that have come to Deptford Market in the first six months of 1877; large decrease of cattle, owing to the restrictions upon import from Germany, whilst there has been an enormous increase of sheep, 8931–8935——Total number of foreign cattle and foreign sheep in the Islington Market in the first six months of 1876, and of 1877; 8936, 8937——Considerable decrease since 1865 in the number of English cattle and sheep sent to London, whilst the foreign supply has largely increased, 8937–8941.

Excellent sanitary condition of Deptford Market, though the smell from carbolic acid used in disinfection is exceedingly offensive, 8942–8946——Particulars as to the course pursued at Deptford in getting rid of thirty-nine carcases of deceased animals in the present year; prompt action taken whilst disinfection was carefully carried out, 8947–8974——Impossibility of disposing of the carcasses by burying them under the market; advantage if there were an available space for the purpose outside the market, 8950, 8951.

Great detriment to trade, and to the usefulness of Deptford Market, by the uncertainty of the regulations as to the import and slaughtering of foreign cattle, 8955–8957. 9085–9091——Conclusion, reluctantly arrived at, that all foreign cattle should be necessarily slaughtered at the port of landing, there being defined ports for the purpose, 8958, 8959.

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Rudkin, Thomas. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

8981. 9085, 9086. 9140–9148. 9163, 9164. 9219——Stability of trade at Deptford, and abundance of competition, if there were a permanent and compulsory system of slaughtering at the port, 8959, 8960. 8967, 8968. 9086–9091. 9146–9148. 9210.

Inaccuracy of certain evidence as to the prices at Deptford being much lower than at Islington, 8960–8969. 9030——Belief that the establishment of a dead-meat supply would be an immense boon to the public, 8968——Great advantage of animals being slaughtered where they are fed; superiority of country-killed meat to that killed in London, whilst under the former plan there is a saving of some five per cent. in absolute weight, 8968–8971. 9046–9049. 9036. 9175, 9176. 9186.

Facility in carrying on a large dead meat trade between Deptford and the country; very large number of sheep carcases sent from Deptford to Wales, and other distant parts, some of which come back again to London, 8972–8975. 9133–9135. 9138, 9139. 9158. 9162——Room for much improvement in the treatment of the offals, whereby they may safely be sent long distances; excellent arrangements in Paris in this respect, 8976–8980. 9134. 9149, 9150. 9187——Approval of absolute prohibition of import from any country where there is cattle plague, 8982.

Decided conviction of witness that the Islington Market is largely supplied with diseased animals, and that it is essential to confine the market to fat stock, which should not be allowed to leave the metropolis alive, 8983–8992. 9140–9142. 9191–9193. 9198–9201——Objection to animals sold in London being allowed to go alive into the country if marked for slaughter, 8991, 8992——Opinion that one market, where all animals should be slaughtered, would suffice for London, 8993, 8994.

Statement as to the London cow-sheds having long been a fruitful source of disease, 8995——Supply by the London dairies of only fifteen per cent. of the milk used in the metropolis, witness submitting that the whole supply could be much better obtained from the country, and that the London cow-sheds should be closed altogether, 8995, 8996——Practice of witness to quarantine any new cows on his farm for at least three weeks; he has had an immunity from disease, 8995–9000——Expediency of a thorough inspection of all cow-sheds in London and elsewhere, 9001, 9002.

Opinion that in the metropolis the Privy Council should supersede all local authorities, and should exercise sole jurisdiction, 9003–9005. 9188.

Excellent condition in which some American meat has recently come to London, *viâ* Liverpool; very fine quality of this meat, which realised seven pence per pound, 9006–9011——Condemnation of about forty-nine tons of American meat by the City authorities in the first six months of 1877; 9012–9015——Belief that the bad condition in which the meat sometimes arrives is due to bad packing, and to the slaughter of the animals in America before they have cooled down after their journey from the interior; facility of correcting these defects, 9016–9021. 9117, 9118. 9194–9196——Very bad treatment of the meat on arrival, 9021.

Prospect of very large supplies from America in good condition, whilst the quality is excellent; great improbability, however, of the Continental live-meat supply being superseded, 9022. 9115, 9116. 9207——Statement showing that American meat will take salt perfectly, 9022, 9023——Sale of American beef to the public as Scotch beef; large profits thereby to the butchers 9024. 9109–9113——Great boon to the public if the American supply came over in such quantity as to supersede the live cattle supply from the Continent, and to reduce the price of meat, 9025–9030.

Opinion that there should be free-trade alike in dead meat and live cattle, but not in the import of disease, 9031. 9037–9039. 9099, 9100. 9163. 9204.

Gradual diminution of the live cattle supply to London, and gradual increase of the dead meat supply, 9031–9035. 9119–9122. 9159–9161——Average of from sixty to seventy tons of dead meat sent from Scotland to London throughout the hot months, 9032, 9033. 9159, 9160——Large supplies of dead meat received also from the West of England and Ireland, even in the hottest weather, 9033, 9034. 9180–9182——Facility of providing direct railway accommodation with Deptford Market, 9040–9042. 9106–9108. 9136.

Gradual increase since 1871 in the number of animals sent to Deptford, 9050–9054——Explanation relative to the much higher charges of the Corporation for each bullock, sheep, and calf in Deptford Market than at Islington, 9055–9074. 9080–9083——Statement showing that the importer has to pay quite as much to get his beast to Islington Market as to Deptford, 9068. 9075–9079.

Opinion that if there were a cordon round the metropolis (as recommended by witness in 1865) foreign cattle might be allowed to come to Copenhagen Market without insisting upon slaughter at Deptford; preference, however, for the latter alternative, 9092–9099. 9139–9148——Objection to an absolute prohibition of the import of live animals into London; probable effect for some time in raising the price of meat, 9099–9103. 9205, 9206——Interested motives by which cattle salesmen are actuated in opposing restrictions upon the import of live stock, 9104, 9105——Comment upon the opposition,

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Rudkin, Thomas. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

at first, of the London butchers to the consumption of American meat; they now buy it very readily, 9114. 9185.

Authority exercised, respectively, by the Metropolitan Board of Works and the Corporation of London in respect of cattle; witness further submitting that they should both be superseded by the Privy Council, 9123-9126. 9188-9190——Number of animals landed respectively at Deptford, Thames Haven, and Brown's Wharf, 9127 9132——Increased supply of slaughter-houses at Deptford if slaughtering of all foreign cattle were compulsory, 9137-9165.

Belief that compulsory slaughter at Deptford would not have the effect of discouraging the import of live animals from abroad, 9144-9148——Statement that the Corporation of London is actuated solely by public considerations in advocating slaughter at Deptford, 9151-9153——Way in which the offal is now disposed of from Deptford without difficulty, 9154-9156.

Dissent from the view that slaughtering at Deptford would make meat dear in the country and cheap in London, 9157, 9158——Prevelance of foot-and-mouth disease among Spanish cattle; grounds for this statement, 9164. 9213-9218——Advantage in an increased use of slaughter-houses at Deptford by retail butchers throughout London; decided tendency in this direction, 9165-9168. 9177-9179.

Quarantine necessary for foreign milch cows if allowed to be imported, 9170-9172. 9211, 9212——Sufficient supplies of good milch cows at home without any import, 9173, 9174. 9212——Further statement as to the facilities and advantages of an extensive dead meat trade, 9177-9185——Long period for which American meat will keep, if it arrives in good condition, 9183, 9184.

Expediency of the cordon round London being regulated by the Privy Council, 9188——Due attention paid to the cleansing of Copenhagen Market, 9191, 9192——Effect of the cattle plague in increasing generally the price of meat, 9197——Approval of a cordon round other large towns as well as London, so that foreign cattle might be admitted within the cordon for slaughter, 9202, 9203.

Long notice necessary before applying a system of compulsory slaughter of foreign animals, 9205, 9206——Doubt as to any English cattle going to Deptford, 9208, 9209——Absence of hardship to English farmers by requiring all animals sent to the Metropolitan Market to be slaughtered within the metropolis, 9220-9223.

Russia. Prohibibition of the importation of cattle from Russia before the outbreak at Hull, in consequence of information as to the existence of cattle plague in that country, *Brown* 20-23——Remarkable fact that the cattle plague does not affect Russian cattle in the same serious way that it affects English cattle, *ib.* 649.

Undoubted introduction of cattle plague from Russia, *Simonds* 1122, 1123——Large amount of cattle disease which results from the movement of the Russian army; in Russia, however, the disease is not so fatal as elsewhere, on account of the hardiness of the cattle, *ib.* 1139-1144. 1203-1207——Absence of necessity for any further stringency in the regulations, except in regard to the greater danger to which we are exposed from the increased facilities given for the movement of cattle from Russia into Germany, *ib.* 1192-1194.

Regulations in Germany with reference to the dangerous boundaries of Russia, *Baron von Behr* 2484-2490. 2560.

Restrictions imposed by the Animals Order of 1875 in reference to the import of cattle and goods from Russia, *App.* 531.

Recommended prohibition of import from Russia, *Rep.* vi. ix.

See also *Cattle Plague. Deptford Market. Foreign Cattle. Germany. Hull.*

S.

Salford. See *American Meat. Manchester and Salford.*

Scheduled Countries. Enumeration in the Contagious Diseases Act of countries termed "scheduled countries," from which animals could only be imported for the purpose of slaughter; certain countries included in the schedule under the Act, *Brown* 3-8. 25-32.

Prejudicial effect upon trade by the system of scheduling different foreign countries at different times, *Gamgee* 7168.

See also *Foreign Cattle,* II.

Schelswig-

Schleswig-Holstein. Grounds for the withdrawal of Schleswig-Holstein from the schedule in 1872; this arrangement made on account of the introduction of cattle plague from Germany into England, by means of Russian cattle, *Brown* 8–12. 27–32——Explanation that witness contemplates the landing of cattle from Schleswig-Holstein at Hull for slaughter, *ib.* 1096, 1100——Conclusion as to the expediency of admitting cattle from Schleswig-Holstein without any limitation whatever, *Simonds* 1171–1182. 1195–1197. 1278–1286. 1326–1336.

Absence of danger in regard to exportation of cattle from Schleswig-Holstein on account of the immunity from cattle plague in that country; strictness of the regulations in Schleswig-Holstein in regard to drawing a cordon round the infected places, *Müller* 1421–1425. 1464, 1465. 1503–1508. 1544, 1545.

Export from Schleswig-Holstein of 70,000 head of cattle annually, *Thomsen* 2156–2161——Impossibility of bringing dead meat to England from Schleswig-Holstein; reason for this conclusion, *ib.* 2161–2169. 2209–2213——Injurious effect upon the trade of Schleswig, if the export of live cattle to England were prohibited, *ib.* 2162, 2163. 2210.

Statement that the cattle plague has not been in Schleswig-Holstein during the present century, *Thomsen* 2175, 2176——Information as to the ports used for the exportation of cattle, *ib.* 2177–2185. 2203–2205. 2216, 2217——Insignificant character of the outbreak of pleuro-pneumonia in Schleswig; only one instance of an attack, which was immediately stamped out, *ib.* 2186–2190. 2192–2194——Compensation paid by the Government for slaughter, to the extent of three-fourths of the value, *ib.* 2191.

Existence in the country of foot-and-mouth disease some years ago, which was effectually stamped out by the Government restrictions, *Thomsen* 2195–2200. 2215——General freedom from cattle diseases for many years, *ib.* 2201, 2202——Explanation as to the character of the occupations carried on by the farmers previous to the exportation of their cattle to England, *ib.* 2218–2226——Information respecting the prices realised for cattle sent to England, *ib.* 2227–2233.

Frequent import of disease from Schleswig-Holstein, which should be treated as part of Germany, *Wilson* 4978——Good size of the home-bred beasts obtained from Schleswig-Holstein, whilst the Jutland store beasts are small, *Gebhardt* 5467——Expected import of cattle chiefly from Schleswig-Holstein in the summer months, *ib.* 5732. 5741.

Prevalence of cattle diseases in Schleswig-Holstein at different periods, *Gamgee* 7028–7032——Statement as to the liability of cattle from Schleswig-Holstein to disease, witness submitting that they should be slaughtered at the port of landing, *Robinson* 8594–8599.

Regulations prescribed by the Animals Order of 1875, in reference to cattle from Schleswig and Holstein, *App.* 531. 538.

See also *Denmark.* *Germany.*

Scotland:

Probable effect upon the cattle trade if compulsory slaughter at the ports in Scotland be adopted, *Swan* 1645–1647——Demand in Scotland supplied from other places, on account of the import from Germany having been stopped, *ib.* 1648, 1649. 1726–1729. 1780, 1781——Assertion that the country was never more free from disease than it is at the present time; grounds for this opinion, *ib.* 1691–1700. 1754——Absence of restrictions of any kind as to the movement of cattle in Scotland, *ib.* 1733.

Statement that the amount of dead meat sent from Scotland to London is nothing to what it was formerly; the consumption in Scotland is much greater than it used to be, *Lyon* 3455–3463. 3566–3572——Approval of the continued sale of Scotch cattle in the Metropolitan Market, *Adams* 8123.

Diminution, loss, and deterioration of cattle and sheep in the Lothians, owing to disease; greater effect upon breeding cattle than upon ordinary feeding stock, *Smith* 8443–8456. 8521, 8522——Belief that under proper regulations disease might be stamped out, and that Lothian farmers would willingly accept restrictions to that end, *ib.* 8458–8460. 8472–8474——Partial dependence of cattle in the Lothians upon the turnip and straw crops; decrease of stock not affected thereby, *ib.* 8505–8511. 8537–8541——The number of cattle in the Lothans is not affected by the price of hay, *ib.* 8515–8519.

Information relative to the Scotch dairy farmers; fewer cattle bred, because cows are kept half fat to bring to market directly disease breaks out, *Smith* 8523–8527——Small proportion of foreign cattle imported which comes to Scotland, *ib.* 8525, 8526.

Outbreak of cattle plague on a former farm of witness in 1865–66; exemption since that time, *Melvin* 8727–8729——Views of the Scotch Chamber of Agriculture as to the expediency of the slaughter of all foreign cattle at the port of debarkation; memorials to the Privy Council to this effect, *ib.* 8742–8748——Memorial also from the district

Report, 1877—*continued.*

SCOTLAND—continued.

association of Mid-Calder praying for certain restrictions on the import of foreign cattle, *Melvin* 8749, 8750.

Feeling of Scotch farmers generally that foreign cattle should be slaughtered at the port of landing, *Melvin* 8751——Great diminution in the import of store stock into Scotland, it being now practically confined to milch cows from Denmark and Holland, *ib.* 8752, 8753. 8858——Feeling of the Scotch farmers adverse to the continued import of foreign cows; danger thereby of the spread of pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease from the dairies in Edinburgh, Leith, and other towns, *ib.* 8754–8776. 8846. 8859–8862. 8879–8881. 8908–8911.

Belief that if all foreign cattle were slaughtered at the port of debarkation, there would be a great increase of home breeding in Scotland for dairy and other purposes, and that better cattle would be bred but for the risk of disease, *Melvin* 8758, 8759. 8855, 8856. 8863, 8864. 8882–8905. 8923–8927——Much less amount of pleuro-pneumonia in the dairies in Glasgow than in Edinburgh and Leith; the former being supplied chiefly from home districts, whilst in the latter there are many Dutch cows, *ib.* 8792–8774. 8845.

Belief that by stringent regulations and by restrictions upon import cattle disease in Scotland may be exterminated; experience of Australia adverted to hereon, *Melvin* 8780. 8783–8795. 8812–8829——Diminished extent to which cows are now kept by farm labourers in Scotland; prejudicial effect of this change, *ib.* 8896–8903——Healthy character of Highland cattle, *ib.* 8917, 8918.

See also *Aberdeen. Edinburgh. Glasgow.*

Select Committee of 1873. Recommendations made by the Committee of 1873, and extent to which carried out; non-adoption of the recommendation that the regulations in Great Britain and in Ireland should be similar, *Brown* 569–573. 581–595. 616–628——Certain recommendations of the Committee which could only have been carried out by means of an Act of Parliament, *ib.* 571–573——Revocation of the Orders made in furtherance of the recommendation of the Committee if 1873 in regard to foot-and-mouth disease, *ib.* 629.

Further consideration of the recommendations made by the Committee of 1873; those which required legislation referred principally to cattle plague and pleuro-pneumonia, *Brown* 1040–1060.

SHEEP:

Statement that the danger of introducing cattle plague by means of sheep is so slight it is not necessary to insist upon their slaughter at the landing-places, *Brown* 26——Extensive attacks of the cattle plague disease in sheep in England; remarkable fact that it has never been introduced into this country by sheep, *ib.* 277, 278.

Statement that it is quite possible for sheep to introduce the cattle plague into England; argument that the absolute prohibition merely of cattle would not be a safeguard against the introduction of the disease, *Simonds* 1129–1132. 1322–1325——Possibility of cattle plague being conveyed by means of sheep; infrequency, however, of sheep being attacked with the disease, *Müller* 1419, 1420. 1520–1523. 1549, 1550——Modified restrictions contemplated as regards sheep, the danger of disease being much less in the case of sheep than of cattle, *Wilson* 4726–4733. 4937.

Statement showing that in the five months, July to November 1876, there were 73,940 more foreign sheep than English sheep sold in the London market, *Gebhardt* 5214–5223. 5404–5409——Very large import of foreign sheep in the first six months of 1877, *ib.* 5223——Considerable diminution in the export of sheep to England since France has opened her frontier; better price obtainable in Paris than at Deptford Market, *ib.* 5225–5234——Great demand for foreigh sheep throughout the Provinces; lower price by 1½*d.* or 2*d.* per pound realised by foreign than by English sheep, *ib.* 5228——Strong objection to the restriction as to the slaughter of foreign sheep at Deptford, *ib.* 5230. 5235, 5236.

Sale of 489,600 English as against 353,150 foreign sheep at Islington Market in the first six months of the year, *Gebhardt* 5410, 5411——Total of about 800,000 English and 750,000 foreign sheep sold in eleven months in 1876, *ib.* 5412.

Necessity of the continued import of sheep; obstacle to the import of mutton in good condition, *Burkett* 6250–6253. 6368–6371——Approval of the exclusion of live sheep, as being liable to communicate foot-and-mouth disease, *Gamgee* 7166——Facility in the transport of sheep in the form of dead meat; practical experience of witness to this effect, *ib.* 7167——Instance of the great loss incurred from foot-and-mouth disease in sheep, *Soulby* 7317–7319.

Great importance to Liverpool and the manufacturing districts of the supply of foreign sheep through the London Market: advantage if the live animals were sent to Liverpool instead of carcases from Deptford, *Luya* 7620–7634——Conclusion as to the diminished stock of sheep in England being partly attributable o fear of disease, *Odams* 8035–8039

Preference

SHEEP—continued.

——Preference of English farmers for the production of wool and mutton, as compared with cattle; 10,000,000 or 11,000,000 home-produced sheep slaughtered in 1876, *Howard* 8181-8183——Far less risk with sheep than cattle, *Smith* 8495.

Expediency of including sheep and pigs in the regulations as to slaughtering at the port, *Read* 9519-9521——Approval of the continued import of German and Belgian sheep if slaughtered at the port of debarkation, *ib.* 9680, 9681.

See also *Bristol.* *Germany.* *Manchester and Salford.*

Sheep-pox. Non-introduction of sheep-pox till 1847; final extirpation of the disease about 1852 by means of compulsory slaughter, this course having also been successfully adopted on subsequent occasions, *Brown* 293-300.

Sheldon, John Prince. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is a farmer in Staffordshire; has passed some time in the United States, and has collected some statistics in reference to the American meat trade, 4432-4439——Information relative to the total number of cattle, of sheep, and of pigs in the States, and the number of each class available annually for slaughter; conclusion as to the very large surplus which may be spared for the supply of England, 4440-4444. 4591, 4592. 4601-4609——Calculations as to the cost of rearing and feeding a bullock in the States, the cost up to the time of shipment to this country in the form of dead meat, and the cost of freight; aggregate of about 18 *l.*, 4445-4466.

Practice of preparing the carcases on shore before shipment, there being sometimes an interval of two or three days; small cost of the process, 4450-4455——Estimate of about 30 *s.* per carcase as the cost of ocean transit, 4456-4461——Cost of about 7 *l.* for the freight of a live animal, and of 1 *l.* 12 *s.* for attendance and food on board, 4467-4471——Large margin of profit in sending dead meat instead of live cattle, 4472.

Inspection by witness of the "dry air" process used in the conveyance of some of the meat cargoes from America; testimony to the perfect condition on arrival at Liverpool of the meat subjected to this process, 4473-4485——Practical trial given by witness to some beef brought over in the "Celtic" in March last; excellence of the quality, both hot and cold, whilst it was kept for several days before it was cooked, 4486-4494.

Prospect of a very large increase in the import of American meat, the present prices being remunerative, 4493-4506——Accidental defects, owing to which some cargoes have arrived in bad condition; belief that these defects can be effectually provided against, 4499-4502——Established rather than experimental character of the trade; statistics hereon as to its gradual increase since its commencement in October 1875; 4504-4509——Belief that the meat can come just as well in hot weather as in cold, 4510-4513.

Opinion that the importation of live cattle from the Continent should be entirely prohibited as a security against cattle plague chiefly, and as a protection also against pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease, 4514-4522. 4563-4573. 4579-4581——Contemplated import of dead meat from the Continent, as well as from America, in lieu of live stock, and in aid of the home supply; belief that a dead meat supply from the Continent would speedily be forthcoming, and would be a profitable trade, 4523-4531. 4675-4679.

Serious loss to farmers when their beasts are attacked with foot-and-mouth disease; average of more than 2 *l.* per head, and of 4 *l.* in some cases, 4532-4537——Readiness of farmers to submit to stringent restrictions, if thereby foot-and-mouth disease can be permanently stamped out, 4538-4540. 4613, 4614.

Belief that not only cattle plague but pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease came originally into this country from abroad, though the latter two diseases may since have become indigenous, 4541-4563——Import of pleuro-pneumonia into this country for the first time in 1840 or 1841, through some Dutch cows which came to Ireland, 4557-4562. 4610-4612. 4645-4659——Explanation that witness would not exclude animals from any country distinctly proved to be absolutely free from disease, 4569-4572——Ample supplies of dead meat to be had from America in lieu of the foreign cattle supply, 4574-4578. 4588-4592. 4601-4609.

Belief that the proposed restrictions upon the import of foreign cattle would eventuate in a permanent dead-meat trade, and in a reduction of price to the consumer, 4579-4588. 4615, 4616——Profitable character of the present prices in the American trade; improbability of any material increase of price, 4593-4600——Examination in further support of the conclusion that it would be more profitable to foreign exporters to send dead meat than live stock to this country, 4617-4644.

Further considerations as to the severe restrictions desirable in order to exterminate foot-and-mouth disease, 4662-4674——Difficulty in applying sufficient precautions for preventing the import of foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia, short of absolute prohibition of all import of live cattle, 4680-4684.

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Shipment of Cattle. Advantage in the animals being allowed time for rest before shipment, *Wilson* 4828, 4829. 4948.——*See* also *Ireland, &c.*, 1–3.

Simonds, Professor James Beart. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Connection of witness with the Privy Council Department from 1865 to 1872; since the latter year he has been Principal of the Royal Veterinary College, 1106–1109 —Considerations as to the effect of importation upon the introduction of cattle diseases into England, 1110 *et seq.*—— Belief that foreign importation has not materially increased pleuro-pneumonia, 1110–1128. 1227. 1314–1318——Possibility of the foot-and-mouth disease having been originally introduced by means of surplus ships' stores; conclusion that it was not spontaneously generated in this country, 1116–1119.

Possible introduction of pleuro-pneumonia in the first instance by means of Dutch cows *viâ* Ireland, 1120, 1121——Cattle plague undoubtedly introduced into England from Russia, 1122, 1123——Grounds for the belief that it would be exceedingly difficult under any circumstances to protect this country from the introduction of cattle plague, 1124–1129.

Statement that it is quite possible for sheep to introduce the cattle plague into England; argument that the absolute prohibition of cattle would not be a safeguard against the introduction of the disease, 1129–1132. 1322–1325——Doubtful expediency of establishing a system of quarantine in regard to store stock coming to this country from countries which are now unscheduled, 1133, 1134. 1239–1244.

Necessity for excluding German cattle from England, unless international arrangements can be made with Germany that her frontier will be closed against the introduction of Russian cattle; desirability of obtaining information as to the approach of the disease towards the German frontier, 1135–1139. 1145–1147——Large amount of cattle disease which results from the movement of the Russian army; in Russia the disease is not so fatal as elsewhere on account of the hardiness of the cattle, 1139–1144. 1203–1207.

Belief that calves born from a mother that had cattle plague during pregnancy are insusceptible of disease; scientific explanation of this immunity, 1143. 1199–1202. 1205, 1206——Concurrence with Professor Brown's opinion that if it be desired to effectually stamp out cattle plague in England, the importation from Germany and Belgium must be absolutely prohibited, 1147. 1190, 1191. 1217——Important, though small, importation of store stock from the Continent; large importation of fat calves from Holland on account of the demand for veal, 1148–1153.

Impossibility of making regulations with regard to Ireland, unless similar regulations are adopted in England, 1154–1157——Stringent regulations absolutely necessary if cattle diseases are to be extirpated in England; belief that such regulations would not be submitted to by the people of this country, 1158, 1159. 1216, 1217. 1252–1257. 1266–1274. 1297–1299.

Difficulties in the way of extending the trade in dead meat, especially during the summer months, 1160–1166——Decided opinion that in the event of the importation of live cattle from Germany and Belgium being prohibited it would not be possible for a dead-meat trade to take the place of the live import; grounds for their conclusion, 1167–1170. 1245–1251. 1304–1313.

Suggestions as to the means to be adopted for dealing with cattle diseases in England; expediency of admitting cattle from Schleswig-Holstein without any limitation whatever, 1171–1182. 1195–1197. 1278–1286. 1326–1336——Information in regard to the great losses suffered by the country on account of cattle plague between the years 1865 and 1867; the loss in 1872 was very much less, 1183–1189. 1192——Absence of necessity for any further stringency in the regulations, except in regard to the greater danger to which we are exposed from the increased facilities given for the movement of cattle from Russia into Germany, 1192–1194.

Doubt whether the importation of dead meat need be prohibited from countries from which the importation of live animals is stopped, 1195–1198——Opinion that slaughter at the port of debarcation would not be a sufficient protection against the cattle plague, 1197. 1208——Entire failure of inoculation for the prevention of cattle plague, 1200——Inexpediency of prohibiting the importation of cattle from any single place, 1208–1210——Approval of the Privy Council superseding the local authority in the event of an outbreak of cattle plague, 1213–1215.

Suggestions as to the countries which should be scheduled in regard to importation of cattle, 1218–1223. 1268–1274. 1278–1291——Probable effect of the prohibition of foreign cattle upon the price of meat, 1227–1231. 1275–1277——Disapproval of killing the animals at the port of embarkation; belief that such a system would not give much security, as it is quite possible for cattle plague to be introduced by dead meat, 1235–1238. 1319–1325.

Further information respecting the amount of losses from cattle plague in 1872, as compared with the years 1865 to 1867; 1258–1265. 1292–1296——Inefficiency of vaccination as a means of prevention of cattle diseases, 1300–1303.

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Slaughter (*Diseased Animals*). Regulations laid down in the various Orders of Council since August 1873 on the subject of slaughter of animals diseased or suspected of disease, *App.* 512 *et seq.*

Necessity of the power to order the slaughter of animals suspected of cattle plague extending to animals on premises adjoining those actually infected; recommendation by the Committee to this effect, *Rep.* iii. ix.

See also *Cattle Plague*, 12. *Compensation. Foot-and-Mouth Disease*, 4. *Pleuro-pneumonia*, 4.

Slaughter at Port of Debarkation. See *Cattle Plague*, 12. *Dead Meat. Denmark*, 3. *Foot-and-Mouth Disease*, 4. *Foreign Cattle*, II. IV. *Germany. Hull. Leeds. Offal. Pleuro-pneumonia*, 4. *Price of Meat*, 2. *Scotland. Sheep. Spain and Portugal.*

Slaughter at Port of Embarkation. See *American Dead Meat. Dead Meat. Denmark*, 4. *Deptford Market*, 2. 4. *Holland*, 3. *Hull. Offal. Price of Meat*, 2.

Slaughter-houses. Control of the Metropolitan Board of Works or the Corporation of London over the slaughter-houses in London, *Lyon* 3496, 3497——Tendency to a reduction in the number of small slaughter-houses in London, *Wilson* 5024——Sanitary advantage if the small slaughter-houses in London were done away with, *Robinson* 8589.

Great advantage by the establishment of slaughter-houses in the agricultural districts, *Rudkin* 9036——Restriction upon the spread of disease if there were an increase of slaughter-houses throughout the country, *Read* 9684-9686.

See also *Deptford*, 5.

Slaughtering (*Generally*). Advantage in giving some rest and food to foreign cattle on arrival before slaughtering them, *Hamilton* 4359-4362——Advantage in animals being fasted for a short time before they are killed, *Wilson* 4954–4959.

Smith, Adam. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Represents the Highland Agricultural Association, 8426, 8427——Recent resolutions passed by the Association in favour of increased restrictions on the import of cattle, 8428–8431——Advantage of dead meat being imported rather than live stock, 8432–8435. 8459. 8463–8471——Evidence to the effect that the importation of store stock should be prohibited, and that all foreign cattle should be slaughtered at the port of debarcation, but not sheep, 8432–8441. 8480–8488. 8490–8495.

Diminution, loss, and deterioration of cattle and sheep in the Lothians, lately; breeding cattle affected by disease more than ordinary feeding stock, 8442–8456. 8521, 8522——Disease attributed to foreign import, 8457——Belief that under proper regulations disease might be stamped out, and that Lothian farmers would willingly accept restrictions to this end, 8458–8460. 8472–8474.

Benefit to the community if the source of introduction of disease into this country were stopped, 8460–8462. 8479——Proposal that the Privy Council should issue uniform regulations, and that a central board should appoint its own officers to carry them out, 8472–8476——Suggestion that the Imperial Government should defray the cost of inspection, 8477–8479.

Far more risk with cattle than sheep, 8495——Explanation that witness is a practical farmer, and has farmed largely for years, but does not breed now, having suffered losses from diseases, 8496–8504. 8520, 8521——Partial dependence of cattle in the Lothians upon the turnip and straw crops; decrease of stock not affected thereby, 8505-8511 8537–8541——Expediency of placing Irish cattle under the same regulations as English and Scotch cattle, 8512-8514.

Number of cattle kept in the Lothians not influenced by the price of hay, though possibly it may be in England, 8515–8519——Information in reference to the Scotch dairy farms; fewer cattle bred in Scotland, because cows are kept half fat to bring to market directly disease breaks out, 8523–8527——Doubt as to the character of the crops grown upon the land formerly used as pasturage for sheep and cattle, 8528-8534——Small proportion (only about six or seven per cent.) of foreign animals imported which come to Scotland, 8535, 8536.

Smuggling (*Import of Foreign Cattle*). Possibility of smuggling being resorted to in the event of specially severe restrictions; belief that there is no practical danger on this score, *Howard* 8367–8372.

Soulby, John. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is secretary to the North Riding of Yorkshire Chamber of Agriculture, 7239, 7240——Particulars relative to the restrictions imposed in the East Riding by the Privy Council and in the North Riding by the local authorities upon the movement of cattle and upon fairs and markets; complaint in the North Riding as to the great inconvenience of these restrictions, 7241–7251. 7332–7337——Suggestion

Soulby, John. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

that the Privy Council should issue all the orders to be carried out, and should so far supersede the local authorities, but that the latter should see to the carrying out of the orders by their own officers, 7248–7253.

Great injury to trade in the North Riding on account of the cattle plague and the restrictions enforced in consequence, 7256, 7257. 7290–7292——Opinion that the import of cattle should be stopped from any country where cattle plague has been known to exist, 7258–7260. 7265. 7268, 7269——Approval of import from Denmark, Spain, and any other countries, if it can be proved that no risks are incurred thereby, 7261–7267. 7332——Readiness of farmers in Yorkshire to submit to severe restrictions for the stamping out of cattle plague, 7270–7272.

Improved regulations desirable as regards slaughter and isolation in the case of pleuro-pneumonia, 7273–7275. 7282–7284——Opinion that in Yorkshire the farmers would object to a general prohibition upon movement or to the stoppage of fairs and markets for a year as a means towards the suppression of pleuro-pneumonia, 7276–7284. 7293. 7320, 7321——Opinion that three-fourths of the value should be given as compensation when an animal is slaughtered for cattle plague, as for pleuro-pneumonia, 7285–7288.

Suggestions for an improved system of isolation in cases of foot-and-mouth disease; objection of the farmers to a stoppage of any general movement, or of markets, on account of the disease, 7289–7302. 7320, 7321. 7336, 7337——Very little foot-and-mouth disease in Yorkshire in the last few years, 7302–7308——Prevalence of pleuro-pneumonia in the county, 7309, 7310——Difficulty in the suppression of this disease on account of the long period of incubation, 7311–7316.

Instance of the great loss incurred from foot-and-mouth disease in sheep, 7317–7319——Opinion that if live cattle were excluded from all countries where there is a liability to disease, there would be a considerable increase of breeding in Yorkshire, 7323–7329——Different restrictions enforced in the West Riding by the County Sessions, and by the boroughs; disadvantage at which the small towns were placed, 7330.

South America. Steps taken in the establishment of a tinned meat trade from South America, as well as from Australia, *Gamgee* 7138–7140——Fair condition in which some cargoes of South American cattle have arrived at Liverpool; doubt as to this trade increasing, *Luya* 7673–7677——Successful experiment in the conveyance of refrigerated dead meat from South America on board the "Frigorific," *Odams* 8000–8004.

Southampton. Order of Council of 5th June 1875, with reference to the landing of foreign cattle at the port of Southampton, *App.* 539, 540.

Spain and Portugal. Approval of dealing with fat stock from Spain, Portugal, and Denmark in the same manner as with animals in this country, *Brown* 732–735——Large and increasing importation of cattle from Spain and Portugal, *Lyon* 3190, 3191.

Large import of live cattle from Spain and Oporto; particulars as to the very superior and healthy quality of these cattle, and as to the good prices realised, *Giblett* 6498–6504. 6564, 6565——Grievance in the compulsory slaughter of Spanish and Portuguese cargoes at Deptford when one or two animals are reported as suffering from foot-and-mouth disease, *ib.* 6505–6509. 6621–6623. 6725, 6726——Great obstacles to a profitable trade in dead meat from Spain and Portugal, *ib.* 6558–6563. 6666——Excellent arrangements for bringing cattle from Oporto, *ib.* 6640–6642——Value of the cattle from Spain and Portugal for the supply of army contracts, *ib.* 6664–6670.

Expediency of stopping import, from Spain and Portugal, though the cattle are naturally healthy, *Gamgee* 7037–7039. 7141–7144.

Very good condition in which the animals arrive from Spain and Portugal, *Sir C. A. Wood* 7417–7419——Very healthy condition in which the Spanish and Portuguese cattle arrive at Liverpool; instances of foot-and-mouth disease, but not of pleuro-pneumonia, *Luya* 7503–7513. 7636. 7749–7755——Instance of a badly diseased cargo of cattle from Oporto, *Odams* 8125–8129.

Statement showing that Spain and Portugal are not free from disease, so that animals from those countries should be slaughtered at the port of landing, *Robinson* 8591–8594——Stationary character of the cattle trade with Portugal, *ib.* 8700, 8701——Obstacles to a dead meat trade from Spain and Portugal in the summer months, *ib.* 8708.

Prevalence of foot-and-mouth disease among Spanish cattle; grounds for this statement, *Rudkin* 9164. 9213–9218——Objection to import from Spain unless the cattle be slaughtered on arrival, *Brown* 10259.

Statistics. Unreliability of agricultural statistics as regard the number of animals in the country, *Read* 9615.——*See* also *Foot-and-Mouth Disease,* 3. *Foreign Cattle,* I., 3. *Loss from Disease.*

Storage of Meat. See *American Dead Meat,* VII.

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Store Cattle. Conviction that foreign store stock with very few exceptions, are not required in England at all; considerable restrictions necessary upon the admission of dairy or other store stock, *Brown* 540-544. 747-751——Important, though small, importation of store stock from the Continent; large importation of fat calves from Holland on account of the demand for veal, *Simonds* 1148-1153.

Objection to any exemption in favour of store cattle, under a system of slaughtering at the port of arrival, *Wilson* 5039-5043——Sufficient supply of store cattle at home without import from abroad, *ib.* 5043. 5118-5121.

Grounds for the proposal that store cattle be excluded from Islington market, and that no cattle be moved thence save under a killing license, *Gebhardt* 5444-5450. 5521, 5522. 5659——Objection to the import of store cattle from suspected countries, even if quarantine were applied, *Soulby* 7266-7269.

Import of some foreign store cattle, chiefly in calves, into the West Riding, *Walker* 7924-7929——Doubt as to the expediency of admitting grazing cattle, *Odams* 8055——Inferior character as a rule of the lean stock imported into Scotland, *Melvin* 8853, 8854.

Explanation that whilst advocating compulsory slaughter at the port, witness would admit store cattle from countries where no disease exists, provided such cattle be subjected to careful restrictions, *Brown* 10230-10232. 10256, 10257.

Recommendation by the Committee as regards store and dairy animals, that they remain in quarantine for fourteen days, and afterwards be placed under inspection for two months, *Rep.* vi. ix.

See also *Calves. Cows. Dairies, &c. Ireland, &c.*, 7. *Quarantine.*

Stratton, William. (Analysis of his Evidence.) Representations in detail as to the exceedingly heavy losses incurred by farmers in Wiltshire from foot-and-mouth disease among cattle, sheep, and pigs; statistics hereon for the years 1872 and 1875; 6774-6783—— Much greater loss by depreciation in value than by death; average of not less than 2 *l.* per head, whilst the loss on milch cows in summer is as much as 5 *l.* per head, 6778, 6779. 6834-6836.

Much less loss in Wiltshire from pleuro-pneumonia than from foot-and-mouth disease, 6784-6786——Complaint in the county that the local authorities cannot apply rules sufficiently stringent, 6787——Recommendations made by the Central Chamber of Agriculture to the Privy Council, with reference to foreign import, slaughter at the port of debarkation, quarantine, home restrictions, &c., 6788.

Grounds for the conclusion that there is a very general unanimity among farmers in favour of more stringent regulations as regards the home trade, 6789, 6790. 6810, 6811. 6823-6825. 6911-6916. 6933, 6934——Entire readiness of the local authorities to submit to a system of Government inspection; consideration as to the source of payment of the increased staff reqired, 6791-6798. 6867.

Excellent condition in which meat arrives from America in hot weather, so that this supply would increase if live cattle were excluded, 6799. 6805——Very large increase anticipated in the home supply in substitution for the foreign supply; great scope for such increase, 6799-6804. 6808. 6837, 6838——Statement as to the price of meat not having risen upon the stoppage of import of German and Dutch cattle, 6805-6808. 6880. 6893-6901.

Approval of very full powers in the Privy Council for dealing with cases of cattle plague, 6809——Statement showing the beneficial effect of the cattle plague restrictions in stamping out foot-and-mouth disease, 6812-6815. 6935-6937——Conviction of witness that this disease can only be conveyed by contagion, and that it was first introduced into England from abroad, 6816-6819. 6845-6849. 6862-6864. 6927-6932.

Effect of the pravalence of contagious diseases in this country in preventing export of English stock, though much wanted abroad for improving the breed of foreign stock, 6820-6822. 6829-6833——Expediency of the proposed continuance of restrictions, with a view to stamping out foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia, 6826-6833. 6845-6849——Advantage of quarantine stations at certain ports, to be used as regards the foregoing diseases, 6831-6833. 6854.

Constant introduction of foot-and-mouth disease into Wiltshire by Irish cattle, *viâ* Bristol; belief that this is chiefly owing to the infected state of the vessels in which the cattle are brought from Ireland, and that the evil may be prevented by careful disinfection, 6839-6845. 6855-6861——It is not proposed to stop import from Ireland, 6843. 6868. 6886, 6887——Opinion that all foreign cattle should be sent to Deptford, 6853——Excessive prevalence of foot-and-mouth disease in other counties as well as in Wiltshire, 6865, 6866.

Contemplated removal of cattle from Ireland to England, and from one place to another in England, subject to a license or certificate as to local exemption from disease, 6868-6875. 6886, 6887——Explanation that the Central Chamber of Agriculture would

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Stratton, William. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

prefer slaughter at the port of embarkation, though asking only for slaughter on landing in England, 6876–6879. 6902–6910——Belief that there would be a large and immediete dead-meat trade with the Continent if live cattle were excluded, 6881–6885.

Arbitrary and unequal restrictions enforced when the cattle plague first appeared, so that the farmers naturally complained, 6888–6892——Expediency of the compulsory slaughter of all animals affected with foot-and-mouth disease; satisfaction to be given to farmers thereby, 6917-6920——Decreased production of cattle and sheep in Wiltshire within the last ten years, 6922–6926.

Surplus Ship's Stores. Expediency of restricting the landing of ship's stores, as was recommended by the Select Committee of 1873, *Brown* 530–533.

Regulations laid down by the Privy Council in June 1875, in reference to surplus ship's stores, *App.* 532.

Surrey. Prohibition on 29th March 1877, of the movement of cattle from Middlesex into Surrey, *App.* 565.

Swan, Thomas. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Large experience of witness as a live-stock agent in Edinburgh; extent and character of the business carried on by him, 1629-1635 —— Statistics of the consumption of cattle during the years 1866, 1871, and 1876; 1636–1641——Material increase in the import from Denmark into Edinburgh during the same period, 1642——Increase of prices concurrently with the introduction of a larger supply of cattle, 1643, 1644.

Statement as to the effect upon the cattle trade of compulsory slaughter at the ports, 1645–1647——Demand in Scotland supplied from other places, on account of the import from Germany having been stopped, 1648, 1649. 1726–1729. 1780, 1781—— Disapproval of slaughter at the port of debarkation as regards protection to the health of the stock in this country; argument that there should be no restriction as to cattle from countries where the plague does not exist, 1650, 1651.

Information respecting the trade in dead meat from America to Glasgow; opinion that this source of supply is not one upon which we can rely, 1652–1668. 1702. 1707–1722. 1782–1800. 1845–1849. 1859–1875—— Considerable variation in the condition of the meat which arrives in hot weather; belief that in hot weather the trade will inevitably decline, 1659–1662. 1664, 1665. 1708. 1782–1784——Grounds for the opinion that the importation of dead meat from the Continent will be impracticable; the principal difficulty in adopting this plan on the Continent will be that of obtaining ice for the purpose of refrigeration, 1666–1668. 1749–1753.

Insignificant amount of depreciation in the value of live stock in transit from America; absence of any depreciation in value or weight in cattle coming from the Continent, 1669, 1770. 1772—— Comparison of value between shipments of live stock and shipments of carcases; larger price given by the butchers for live animals than for meat which is killed on the other side, 1670–1672. 1737. 1755–1769. 1812–1814. 1824. 1845. 1853–1858—— Statement of the proportion of store cattle imported into England from Denmark, Sweden, and Norway; large number of cattle introduced from Denmark for dairy purposes, 1673–1682. 1740–1747.

Further observations as to the expediency of admitting cattle without restriction from countries free from disease, and absolutely prohibiting their import alive in the event of cattle plague breaking out, 1683–1690. 1730–1732——Desirability of trusting to international communications to prevent disease from spreading, and, at the same time, of removing the existing restrictions, 1689, 1690. 1701.

Assertion that the country was never more free from disease than it is at the present time; grouds for this opinion, 1691–1700. 1754——Constant presence of pleuro-pneumonia among dairy cattle; expediency of prohibiting dairies in large towns, 1693–1696. 1699. 1723–1725——Serious amount of foot-and-mouth disease in the cattle imported to Scotland from Ireland in the last year, 1703–1706. 1815–1823—— Absence of restrictions of any kind as to the movement of cattle in Scotland, 1733.

Larger profit obtained by the salesman from the sale of imported dead meat than from the sale of imported live stock, 1734–1739—— General freedom from disease in regard to the cattle imported from Denmark, 1748——Preference for the live animal to the importation of dead meat, because the former can be moved about from market to market, 1763–1768.

Opinion that cattle plague is an imported disease, but that pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease can be generated in this country without either contagion or infection from abroad, 1773–1776——Belief that foot-and-mouth disease is atmospherical, 1777–1779——Decided opinion that the supply of dead meat in England will not continue, 1796–1798——Information relative to the fittings of the ships in which live stock are imported, 1801–1808.

Belief

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Swan, Thomas. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

Belief that the import of live stock is likely to increase, 1809–1811——Greater liability of the Irish cattle to foot-and-mouth disease than the English or Scotch cattle, 1821——Increase of consumption of beef in this country as compared with the supply, 1850–1852——Statement that home meat would keep better than imported dead meat, 1873–1875.

Swan, Mr. Explanation that Mr. Swan, of Edinburgh, is interested much more largely in the home than foreign trade, *Pool* 5788, 5789.

Sweden and Norway. Regulations for importation and export of cattle with reference to contagious diseases, *App.* 586–589.

Royal Decree of 19th April 1875 concerning infectious diseases among home stock, *App.* 589, 590.

Extract from publication by the Royal Board of Health conveying advice and instruction for commercial authorities and others, *App.* 590, 591.

Special information relative to live stock in Norway, the export and import of stock, and the regulations for the suppression of disease, *App.* 591–593.

Number of live stock in Norway at the expiration of 1875, *App.* 591——Number of live stock imported into Norway in each of the years 1871–75; particulars hereon, *ib.* 591. 594, 595——Particulars of exportation in each of the years 1871–75, *ib.* 595.

Regulations under Acts of 27th February 1866 and 26th May 1877 for the suppression of virulent contagious diseases among domestic animals, *App.* 596–600.

Regulations for the suppression of scab amongst sheep and goats, *App.* 600, 601.

T.

Tallerman, Mr. Immense trade carried on at Tallerman's stores, chiefly in American meat, the price to the public having been fixed for three months certain; loss at times through the necessity of falling back on Scotch meat, *Burkett* 6195–6202. 6316–6319.

Texas. Belief that the Texan cattle disease could not be imported by means of dead meat, *Brown* 995–998——Opinion that the small risk of introducing the Texan cattle disease into England would not be sufficient reason for stopping the importation of live cattle from America, *ib.* 1080–1083.

Thomsen, G. A. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is a practical farmer and grazier in Schleswig-Holstein, 2153–2155——Export from Schleswig-Holstein of 70,000 head of cattle annually, 2156–2161——Injurious effect upon the trade of Schleswig if the export of live cattle to England were prohibited, 2162, 2163. 2210——Impossibility of bringing dead meat to England from Schleswig-Holstein; reasons for this conclusion, 2161–2169. 2209–2213.

Belief that if the cattle imported to Deptford had to be slaughtered at the port of debarkation the production would greatly diminish, 2170–2174——Statement that the cattle plague has not been in Schleswig-Holstein during the present century, 2175, 2176——Information as to the ports used for the exportation of cattle, 2177–2185. 2203–2205. 2216, 2217——Insignificant character of the outbreak of pleuro-pneumonia in Schleswig; only one instance of an attack in 1874, which was immediately stamped out, 2186–2190. 2192–2194.

Compensation paid by the Government for slaughter to the extent of three-fourths of the value, 2191——Existence in the country of foot-and-mouth disease some years ago, which was effectually stamped out by the Government restrictions, 2195–2200. 2215——General freedom from cattle diseases in Schleswig-Holstein for many years, 2201, 2202——Explanation as to the character of the occupations carried on by the farmers previous to the exportation of their cattle to England, 2218–2226——Information respecting the prices realised for cattle sent to England, 2227–2233.

Tisdall, Edmund Charles. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is Chairman of the Committee of the Metropolitan Draymen's Society, 9360–9362——Meeting held by the society in March last, at which it was recommended that all live store stock and milch cows from abroad should undergo a quarantine of fourteen days, 9363, 9364——Question considered as to a quarantine of fourteen days being sufficient as regards pleuro-pneumonia, 9365–9368. 9389–9394. 9473, 9474.

Extensive experience of witness as a breeder of dairy cattle, 9369–9375. 9441——Existence of pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease amongst his cows, though only to a limited extent, since he has given up buying in the London market; reference hereon to the modes of introduction of these diseases, 9376–9388——Decided preference

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Tisdall, Edmund Charles. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

of witness for the English shorthorn as compared with the Dutch cow; conclusion as to the former being the better milkers, 9390–9395. 9445–9452. 9470–9472.

Entire readiness of dairymen and farmers to submit to stringent regulations as regards inspection and movement of cattle, so that they may be secured against disease, 9396–9400. 9406. 9424–9426——Approval of increased facilities for the entry of inspectors into dairy yards, 9400–9403——Expediency of a district separation between store markets and fat stock markets, 9404, 9405.

Personal opinion of witness that the advantage as regards price in the purchase of Dutch cows does not compensate for the risk of disease, 9407–9412. 9477–9481——Considerable increase in the price of milk owing to the increased cost of cows and the risk from disease, 9413–9415——Increase of home breeding and probable reduction of price if foreign cows were excluded, 9416–9418.

Expediency of uniform regulations under a central authority, 9419, 9420. 9427, 9428——Opinion that the appointment of inspectors should rest with the central authority, 9421–9423——Very large number of cases of foot and-mouth disease detected at the ports, these cases being dealt with in a variety of ways instead of under a uniform system, 9427, 9428.

Evidence as to the advantage of well-conducted cowsheds or dairies in London on account of the facility thereby for supplying milk in a fresher and sweeter condition for the use of nurseries than when the milk has to come from the country, 9428–9438——Probable supply of one-third or one-fourth of the milk used in London from town dairies, 9439, 9440——Beneficial operation of a system of quarantine, nothwithstanding the cost involved; conclusion that such cost should be borne in the first instance by the vendor, 9442–9444. 9453–9469. 9482.

Statement as to foot-and-mouth disease being far more infectious and destructive than pleuro-pneumonia, 9473–9476——Comparatively small import of store cattle into London, so that the supply could be dispensed with without increasing the price of milk, 9483–9485.

Towns. Spread of disease mainly from the large towns, *Gamgee* 7079——Very little pleuro-pneumonia in Scotland save in the towns, *Melvin* 8778, 8779.

See also *Dairies and Cowsheds.*

Trade. Expediency of permitting the introduction of certain animal products, on account of the exigencies of important trades in this country, *Brown* 346, 347.

Transit of Cattle. Unavoidable deterioration and injury in conveying fat cattle by ship and railway instead of dead meat, *Sir C. A. Wood* 7440, 7441. 7464, 7465. 7467–7480——Improved regulations enforced by the Privy Council in reference to the inland transit of cattle, *Read* 9608, 9609.

Want of increased powers in the Privy Council for dealing with inclosed spaces or railway pens, where animals are placed before removal by rail; that is, on the score more especially of disinfection, and of watering the animals, *Brown* 9968–9975. 10113–10117.

Regulations laid down by the Animals Order of 1875, in regard to the transit of animals by sea and by railway respectively, *App.* 527, 528.

See also *Cattle Drovers. Cattle Ships. Dead Meat,* 8. *Ireland, &c.,* 1–3. *Railways.*

Treatment of Disease. Belief that three-fourths of the disease in this country might be prevented by humane and proper treatment, *Odams* 8044, 8045.

See also *Inoculation. Movement of Cattle.*

U.

Uniformity of Regulations. Great disadvantage that the regulations with regard to the stoppage of disease are varying or permissive, *Brown* 616, 617. 984–988——Concurrence of evidence in favour of uniformity of regulations under a central authority, *Lambert* 3913–3916; *Wilson* 4696–4700. 4750–4760; *Melvin* 8803–8809; *Tisdall* 9419, 9420. 9427, 9428——Expediency of uniform regulations for England, Scotland, and Ireland, *Melvin* 8913; *Read* 9588–9593; *Brown* 9978–9983——Expediency of uniformity of action throughout each county, *Read* 9627–9630.

Conclusion of the Committee as to the necessity of uniform rules applicable to all districts declared infected, *Rep.* v. ix.

See also *Local Authorities. Privy Council.*

United States. See *American Cattle. American Dead Meat. Texas.*

V.

Vaccination. Inefficacy of vaccination as a means of prevention of cattle diseases, *Simonds* 1300–1303.

Veterinary Department (*Privy Council*). See *Inspection. Privy Council.*

W.

Walker, William. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Representation by witness of the Leeds Butchers' Association, 7771–7773——Great falling off in the import of foreign cattle into the port of Hull since the restrictions imposed in January 1877, witness and other Leeds' butchers no longer obtaining supplies from the Hull market, 7774–7788. 7896–7902——Diversion of trade from Hull to Newcastle, 7781. 7843——Complaint as to the prejudicial effect of slaughtering foreign cattle on debarkation at Hull, as compared with the former system of bringing the animals to Leeds for slaughter, 7789–7792. 7795–7804. 7844. 7903.

Practice of witness in purchasing Irish fat cattle in Leeds since he has been precluded from obtaining foreign cattle from Hull; good and sound condition of the Irish animals, 7793. 7910–7917——Impracticability of a dead-meat trade with Ireland, 7794——Difficulty as regards offal for the lower classes in Leeds, if live animals were not killed on the spot, 7795–7800——Relative cost of conveying dead meat and live animals from Hull to Leeds, 7801–7804.

Particulars relative to the American meat supplies to Leeds; very indifferent condition in which the meat has arrived, whilst the demand has greatly fallen off, witness believing that the trade cannot be maintained at a profit, 7805–7817. 7821–7824. 7861–7879——Expediency of foreign cattle being freely imported from all countries, save where there is cattle plague, without any restriction as to slaughtering at the port, 7825, 7826. 7908, 7909.

Very rare instances of pleuro-pneumonia in Leeds, 7827–7829——Considerable increase in the price of meat during the last thirty years, the consumption having greatly increased; doubt as to the losses from cattle plague having influenced the price, 7830–7837. 7845–7856. 7881–7884. 7930, 7931——Limited extent to which dead meat comes from London to Leeds; belief that no live animals come from London, 7838–7843. 7885–7887.

Inferior condition of American meat on arrival at Leeds, as compared with meat from Scotland, 7875–7880——Depressed state of the butchers' trade; less profit on American meat than on foreign cattle slaughtered at home, 7888–7895——Very good condition in which some American cattle have been landed at Hull, 7904–7907——Tendency to an increase of home stocks in the districts round Leeds, 7918–7922——Import of some foreign store cattle, chiefly in calves, into the West Riding, 7924–7929.

Waterford. Want of improved arrangements at Waterford for the accommodation of cattle before shipment, *Sir C. A. Wood* 7400, 7401. 7445.

Watering of Cattle. Non-provision of watering arrangements at many railway stations, *Adams* 8134, 8135. 8140–8142——Expediency of cattle being rested, and fed and watered before they embarked, *Read* 9707–9711.

List of railway stations at which water is to be provided for animals according to the Order of Council of June 1875, *App.* 534–538.

See also *Ireland, &c.*, 1–3.

Waterside Depôts. Importance of cattle being rested before shipment in waterside depôts properly cleansed and disinfected, *Sir C. A. Wood* 7409. 7421, 7422. 7446.

See also *Ireland and Irish Cattle*, 1–3. *Transit of Cattle.*

Whitwill, Mark (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is managing owner of some steamers trading between Bristol and New York, 1876——Information as to the means adopted on these steamers for carrying dead meat from America; opinion that the meat, if properly cared for as regards temperature, may be kept sound for an indefinite period, 1877–1885. 1913–1926. 1989–1991.

Description of the manner in which the meat chambers on the steamers are kept at an even temperature; great importance of maintaining the required temperature without fluctuation, 1882–1885. 1947–1950. 1965–1969. 1986–1988——Regular consignments of dead meat received from America since last April; belief that every cargo might arrive

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Whitwill, Mark. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

in good condition if thorough care were taken, 1886–1905. 1925, 1926. 1953–1964. 1992–1995. 2006, 2007——Decided opinion that this trade in dead meat will continue to develope; argument that there is no limit to the amount which America can provide, 1901, 1902. 1971–1973.

Information in regard to the price at which this meat has been put upon the market; absence of fluctuation in price for good meat, 1906–1912. 1927–1931. 1975–1986. 1996, 1997——Examination respecting the cost of freight and transit generally from America to this country, 1933–1938. 1945, 1946——Impossibility of comparing the cost of transit of live animals with the cost of conveying dead meat, Bristol being a prohibited port for the importation of live animals, 1939–1942——Difficulty in bringing a whole cargo of dead meat on account of the ship not being low enough in the water, 1949, 1950.

Considerable distance which cattle have to travel in America before being slaughtered at the abattoirs in New York, 1998–2002——Possibility of bringing this meat in hot weather as well as in cold proved by the experience of last summer; expense of transit not greater in hot than in cold weather, 2003, 2004——Rise in price in America on account of the increased demand in England, 2004–2007.

Further description of the manner in which the temperature of the meat chamber on board ship is reduced, 2004——Continuation of the consignments made by witness' ships at the present time, 2006, 2007——Additional observations in regard to the price and amount of profit received by the shipper, 2008, 2009.

Wilson, Jacob. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is a tenant farmer at Morpeth, and is secretary to the Northumberland Agricultural Society; is also a member of the council of the Royal Agricultural Society of England, by which body he has been deputed to give evidence before the Committee, 4686–4691.

Resolution passed by the council of the society in March last in favour of the total prohibition of the import of live stock from European ports, this resolution having led to the present inquiry, 4692–4695——Representation made by the society, after the outbreak at Willesden, to the effect that the local authorities should be superseded by the Privy Council with a view to more effectual steps being taken for preventing the spread of the disease, 4696–4700.

Insufficiency of inspection and slaughter at the port of debarkation as a means of preventing the spread of cattle plague, so that the Agricultural Society were constrained to recommend total prohibition of import, 4701. 4704——Large number of cargoes landed in the last three years which have been affected with foot-and-mouth disease, 4701——Liability to the import of cattle plague by Germany from Russia, and by England from Germany, in spite of the increased restrictions and precautions adopted or proposed to be adopted by the latter country, 4701–4715——Admission as to the decreased danger through the more telegraphic information promised from Germany, 4708–4714.

Enhanced danger in the case of pleuro-pneumonia, on account of the lengthened time taken in the development of the disease, 4716–4718, 4835–4837——Alternative proposition that prohibition of import be confined to those countries in which disease is known to exist, or into which diseased animals are introduced, and that import be allowed from other countries, provided the cattle be slaughtered at the port of debarkation, 4719–4725. 5083–5086——Modified restrictions contemplated as regards sheep, the danger of disease being much less in the case of sheep than of cattle, 4726–4733. 4937.

Explanation that witness looks to a dead-meat supply as fully meeting the wants of the country, the import of live stock being prohibited, 4733–4735——Belief that the indirect loss to the country by the cattle plague in 1865 was double the direct loss, the latter being estimated at 5,000,000 *l*; 4736–4738——Calculation that there are a million less cattle in the country than before the outbreak of 1865; 4738–4741. 4970, 4971.

Statistics to the effect that the price of meat is now 1½ *d.* dearer per pound than it was in the two years before the outbreak of 1865; 4742–4745——Severe losses from foot-and-mouth disease subsequently to the removal of the cattle plague restrictions in 1865–66; comment hereon upon the action of Government at the time in ceasing to furnish returns of the losses from disease, 4746–4750. 4754. 5095–5098——Unequal and inconsistent exercise of the powers of the different local authorities under the Act of 1869; illustration in Northumberland, 4751–4753. 4755–4759. 4773, 4774.

Conclusion as to the necessity of central and uniform action for the enforcement of regulations and restrictions, 4756–4760. 5101, 5102——Belief as to the willingness of the local authorities to concur in the appointment of inspectors by the central authority, 4761–4763. 4941.——Concurrence in Professor Brown's suggestion for dividing the country into districts and for preventing movement out of any centre in which pleuro-pneumonia or foot-and mouth disease exists, 4764–4781.

Expected

Wilson, Jacob. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

Expected willingness of farmers to conform to the proposed restrictions upon movement, if these are enforced through the Privy Council, 4772-4781——Doubt as to the necessity of so long a period as six years for stamping out foot-and-mouth disease, 4775-4778. 5077——Expediency of the same restrictions being applied to Ireland as to England, 4782-4784.

Particulars as to the serious losses of witness from foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia, those animals suffering most from the latter which had previously suffered from the former, 4785-4798——Considerable loss of witness through an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease among his ewes before lambing, 4798——Very prejudicial effect of the risk of disease in preventing or checking the breeding of stock in the country; illustration on this point, 4799-4803. 4933-4936——Importance of accurate scientific knowledge in dealing with cases of pleuro-pneumonia, 4804.

Grounds for the conclusion that the full value should be paid as compensation for diseased animals, or animals in contact with diseased animals, slaughtered upon information given by the owner; certificate to be given in each case by the local inspector, 4805-4818——Allowance to be made, in awarding compensation, for the value of the carcase as food, 4814-4817——Opinion that compensation should be defrayed from Imperial rather than from local sources, 4819-4821.

Suggestion that cattle ships be specially fitted and ventilated, be licensed to carry only a certain number, and be used for cattle exclusively, 4822-4825. 4947——Doubt as to the value of inspection before the vessel comes into port, 4826——Limited risk of the spread of disease if the animals be slaughtered on landing, 4827, 4828——Advantage in the animals being allowed time for rest before shipment, 4828, 4829. 4948——Reference to the lairs at foreign and home ports as fruitful sources of disease, 4829. 4947——Decided objection to an English inspector at the foreign port, 4830-4832.

Statement as regards dairies in towns to the effect that they are hotbeds of infection, more especially as regards pleuro-pneumonia, 4833-4835. 4851, 4852. 4983——Great want of further restrictions upon the movement of cows in and out of town dairies, 4834. 4838-4840——Illustration of the insidious character of pleuro-pneumonia, and of the long period of incubation, 4835-4837——Conclusion that dairies should be removed from towns altogether; particulars hereon as to the extensive operations of the Aylesbury Dairy Company, and the successful system of refrigeration adopted by the Company, 4840-4852. 4893-4898. 5019-5023. 5036. 5067, 5068——Prospect of milk being produced more largely than cheese when refrigeration is more valued, 4847. 5122, 5123.

Opinion as to the good quality of the American dead meat sent to this country, and as to the excellent condition in which it arrives, 4853-4857——Authority for the conclusion that as a result of the refrigerating process the meat from America is perfectly capable of resisting heat and atmospheric changes, 4858-4867. 4870. 4908——Great importance attached to the dead-meat trade, in the interests of the public, 4868. 4873-4876.

Room for great improvement in this country in the mode of treating meat, refrigeration being unduly neglected, 4868-4870——Prospect of an increased development of the dead-meat trade, in substitution of live animals for daily slaughter, 4871-4876. 4906-4912. 4921, 4922——Illustration of the great loss to the country as well as to owners when cattle are attacked with foot-and-mouth disease, 4878-4885——Greater loss from foot-and-mouth disease than from pleuro-pneumonia or cattle plague, 4886-4890. 4975.

Less severe restrictions required as to slaughter in the case of pleuro-pneumonia than of cattle plague, 4890-4892——Advantage on sanitary grounds in London and other large towns being supplied entirely with country milk, 4893-4898——Other causes besides the cattle plague of 1865 to which the subsequent increase in the price of meat may be attributable, 4899-4901. 5087-5094.

Further evidence in support of the conclusion that dead meat can be imported in full substitution for the live cattle import, the import required being only about seven per cent. of the whole consumption, 4902-4917. 4921, 4922——Tendency to a reduction rather than an increase of price by stopping the import of foreign cattle; that is, through the increased import of dead meat and the increase of breeding, 4902, 4903. 4918-4920. 4990.

Respects in which the farmer, as well as the nation, will be much better off for the stoppage of foreign import and the avoidance of disease; tendency to a large increase of breeding and of store cattle, 4918-4920. 4925-4930. 4960, 4961——Prospect of a dead meat supply from the Continent as well as from America, 4921, 4922——Facility in settling the amount of compensation for cattle slaughtered by order of the Privy Council, 4923, 4924——Numerous farms unlet throughout the country owing very much to the loss of capital through cattle diseases, 4935, 4936——Belief that the quality of milk is not injured by refrigeration, 4938-4940.

Importance of a strict check upon the movement of cattle in Ireland and upon the holding of fairs, wherever disease exists; expediency on the other hand of due facilities for the export of store cattle to England, 4942-4945. 5052-5059. 5103-5107——Ob-

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Wilson, Jacob. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

jection to farmers being free to deal with foot-and-mouth disease, without control by a central department, 4949–4953——Advantage in animals being fasted for a short time before they are killed, 4954-4959.

Valuable character of certain precautions suggested at the place of export in Ireland in reference to foot-and-mouth disease, 4962–4969——Degree of loss to the consumer further adverted to; that is, through the decreased supply of cattle in the country, 4970–4974——Preference for total prohibition of import in view of the liability of Germany to cattle plague from Russia, 4976.

Proposed exception in the case of Denmark as regards prohibition with reference to pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease, 4977. 5086——Frequent import of disease from Schleswig-Holstein, which should be treated as part of Germany, 4978——Expediency of treating Ireland in the same way as England instead of as a foreign country, 4979-4982.

Doubt as to pleuro-pneumonia or foot-and-mouth disease originating otherwise than by contagion, 4984-4989——Improbability of disease being imported by means of dead meat, 4991, 4992——Further statement in favour of prohibiting import from Germany and Schleswig-Holstein in view of the existence of disease in those countries, 4993–4997. 5007–5009—— Less cost in the transmission of dead meat than of live stock; objection however to free trade in the matter, 4998-5001——Willingness of witness to be confined to a dead-meat trade if it were necessary in his case for preventing the spread of disease, as in the case of foreign import, 5002–5012.

Very fine cattle imported from America; explanation hereon that witness does not propose to prohibit American import, but only to apply careful restrictions, 5013 5018. 5035. 5080–5082. 5108–5115——Tendency to a reduction in the number of small slaughter-houses in London, 5024——Admission as to the virtual prohibition upon the import of live cattle from America if the vessels were not allowed to carry any other freight; witness proposes the latter restriction only as regards the Continent, 5027–5035.

Facility of artificially producing ice in sufficient quantities for refrigeration of meat as well as of milk; limited expense involved, 5036–5038. 5061–5068. 5074——Objection to any exemption in favour of store cattle, under a system of slaughtering at the port of arrival, 5039–5043——Sufficient supply of store cattle at home without import from abroad, 5043. 5118–5121——Reference to certain calculations as to the enormous annual loss when foot-and-mouth disease is rife in comparison with the value of the total annual import of cattle, 5044–5051——About equal cost in bringing a live animal from Hamburg and a carcase from America, 5069–5073.

Comparatively small increase of charge for inspection in order to apply more efficient precautions, 5075, 5076—— Readiness of witness to face the competition of a dead-meat import if it will free him from the risk of disease, 5078, 5079——Dissent from the conclusions of the Select Committee of 1873 as to the modified restrictions desirable in the case of foot-and-mouth disease, 5099, 5100.

Necessity of stringent regulations at home concurrently with prohibitory regulations as to foreign import, 5116, 5117——Means of dispensing with the import of Dutch cows for dairy purposes, 5120–5123——Question as to the proposed restrictions being injurious to the cottiers or small farmers in Ireland by reducing the price of their stock; benefit on the other hand by the exemption from disease, 5124–5128——Total of thirty-six counties and twenty-nine boroughs in which there are restrictions in force as regards cattle plague, 5129.

Wiltshire. Details as to the heavy losses incurred by farmers in the county from foot-and-mouth disease in 1872 and 1875, *Stratton* 6774–6783. 6834–6836——Much less loss in Wiltshire from pleuro-pneumonia than from foot-and-mouth disease, *ib.* 6784–6786.

Complaint in the county that the local authorities cannot apply rules sufficiently stringent, *Stratton* 6787——Decreased production of cattle and sheep in Wiltshire within the last ten years, *ib.* 6922–6926.

Wood, Sir Charles Alexander. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Has been for several years deputy chairman of the Great Western Railway; was formerly an Emigration Commissioner, 7338–7340——Circumstances under which witness made some investigations in 1864 into the mode of shipment of cattle from Irish ports, as well as into the arrangements on board the cattle boats, and the treatment on the voyage; improvements then required, some of which have since been effected, 7341–7344. 7442–7445.

Considerable deterioration formerly in the condition and value of Irish oxen during the transit to England, 7344——Steps in contemplation some years ago for establishing a dead-meat trade between Ireland and England, *ib.*——Result of an inquiry by witness into the shipment of cattle from Cork and Waterford that disease is largely impregnated in the lay fields, and that waterside depôts are much required, 7345–7347. 7446.

Report, 1877—*continued.*

Wood, Sir Charles Alexander. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

Evidence showing the great disadvantages of the system of bringing passengers and cattle in the same ships from Ireland; important improvement by the special construction and fitting up of vessels for cattle exclusively, 7347-7354. 7468, 7469——Importance of cattle being rested before shipment in waterside depôts, properly cleansed and disinfected, 7350, 7351. 7409. 7421, 7422. 7426——Expediency of rigid inspection at the port of landing in England as well as at the port of shipment in Ireland, 7352. 7423-7426.

Reference to a certain statement as showing that the cattle rates from Ireland to England are comparatively high, 7352——Higher price realised by the animals if brought over in better condition in improved boats, 7353, 7354——Explanation relative to the improved arrangements proposed by witness by means of cattle depôts at Cork and Waterford, and at Portishead; this scheme has been submitted to the Privy Council, but nothing has been done under it, 7355-7360. 7393-7396.

Result of witness' experience that arrangements may readily be made for the successful conveyance of dead meat in very large quantities by railway from the country to London and other towns, or *vice versâ;* considerable quantity now conveyed over the Great Western Railway, 7360-7381. 7383-7392——Belief that Mr. Ash, manager of the Piston Freezing Company, is the inventor of the cold-air process as applied to dead meat; great value of this invention, 7363. 7366.

Special dead-meat vans being constructed for use on the Great Western line; good prospect of their success in the hottest weather, 7363-7368. 7376-7378—— Belief that by the cold-air process dead meat may be safely brought from Ireland to England, 7378-7381——Large increase contemplated in the import of store cattle from Ireland; that is, under improved regulations, 7382.

Information relative to the large fish trade from Kinsale over the Great Western Railway; conclusion that dead meat may be carried with equal success, 7383-7392——Very good cattle depôt at Cork, belonging to the Cork Steamship Company, 7397-7399——Want of improved arrangements at Waterford, 7400, 7401. 7445——Considerable improvement in the cattle arrangements in Dublin, 7400. 7445.

Great cruelty towards cattle and pigs in the act of embarkation at Irish ports, and in their removal into railway trucks at the English ports, 7402-7407——Decided improvement if all cattle drovers were licensed, 7407, 7408. 7447, 7448——Importance of improved arrangements on board the Irish cattle ships, in conjunction with proper waterside depôts; liability otherwise to continued import of foot-and-mouth disease from Ireland, 7409-7422. 7433. 7460-7463.

Prevalence of much foot-and-mouth disease in Breconshire, introduced by Irish cattle, 7412. 7474-7476——Advantage of markets specially for Irish stock after arrival in England, 7426. 7472, 7473——Particulars relative to the vessels employed by the Great Western Company in the Waterford cattle trade; facilities for cleansing them, 7427-7429. 7449-7453——Varying distances for which the cattle travel to the port of shipment in Ireland; practice of placing them in lay fields at the port, 7430-7433.

Great convenience in the distribution of dead meat from Deptford Market if the railway were extended directly into the market, 7434, 7435——Introduction of disease from Ireland chiefly by means of store cattle, which go to all parts of England, 7436-7439——Belief that the American meat trade will probably lead to a dead-meat trade with Ireland, 7440.

Unavoidable deterioration and injury in conveying fat cattle by ship and railway, instead of dead meat, 7440, 7441. 7464, 7465. 7477-7480——Healthy character of cattle in Ireland, disease being developed during the transit to England, 7454-7460. 7470——Better rates for the conveyance of dead meat than live stock, 7471.

Information relative to the different companies conveying cattle, sheep, and pigs between Ireland and England; doubt as to the proportion carried by railway boats, 7481-7485——Increasing dead-meat trade from the West of England to London, 7486——Preference of butchers for a live cattle trade, the "fifth quarter" never being accounted for, 7487.

Worcestershire. Action taken by the local authority of the county under the Cattle Plague Order of January 1877, *App.* 561, 562.

Y.

Yorkshire. Very great losses of witness in Yorkshire from foot-and-mouth disease; his herd was reduced more than one-half by this disease, *Booth* 2243-2249. 2267-2271. 2313. 2332-2334. 2341, 2342——Information respecting the restrictions at present existing with regard to the movement of cattle in Yorkshire; undoubted opinion that the advantages of stringent restrictions far outweigh the disadvantages, *ib.* 2250-2261. 2266. 2272-2289. 2296-2300. 2303-2322. 2337——Great loss to breeders and also to consumers

Yorkshire—continued.

sumers on account of the prohibition of foreign exportation; stoppage also of the Irish trade at the present time, *Booth* 2257–2261. 2272. 2274. 2284.

Particulars relative to the restrictions imposed in the East Riding by the Privy Council, and in the North Riding by the local authorities, upon the movement of cattle and upon fairs and markets; complaint in the North Riding as to the great inconvenience of these restrictions, *Soulby* 7241–7251. 7332–7337—Great injury to trade in the North Riding on account of the cattle plague, and the restrictions enforced in consequence, *ib.* 7256, 7257. 7290–7292.

Very little foot-and-mouth disease in Yorkshire in the last few years, *Soulby* 7302–7308—Prevalence of pleuro-pneumonia in the county, *ib.* 7309, 7310.

Opinion that if live cattle were excluded from all countries where there is a liability to disease, there would be a considerable increase of breeding in Yorkshire, *Soulby* 7323–7329—Different restrictions enforced in the West Riding by the County Sessions and by the boroughs; disadvantage at which the small towns were placed, *ib.* 7330.